A DEFENCE OF A CHARGE CONCERNING SUBSCRIPTIONS, IN A LETTER TO THE AUTHOR OF THE CONFESSIONAL.

By T. RUTHERFORTH, D. D. F. R. S.
Archdeacon of Eſſex, Kings Profeſſor of Divinity in Cambridge,
And Chaplain to
Her Royal Highneſs the Princeſs Dowager of Wales.

CAMBRIDGE:
Printed by J. ARCHDEACON, Printer to the UNIVERSITY,
For J. WOODYER, in Cambridge;
And Sold by J. BEECROFT, and Meſſrs. ROBINSON, and ROBERTS,
in Pater-noſter-Row; J. DODSLEY, in Pall-Mall; C. BATHURST,
in Fleet-Street; and T. CADELL, in the Strand, London.
M.DCC.LXVII.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

A LETTER TO THE AUTHOR OF THE CONFESSIONAL.

SIR;

THERE is an obvious reaſon, why you ſhould be willing to think, that my ſhort diſcourſe required no anſwer at all, or however that what was next to none, [1] *the examination*, which "it met with *ſo ſuddenly*," would be ſufficient. [2] The *confeſſional* had been eleven years in your training, and though you ſent it into the world at laſt, as [3] "a fatherleſs production of the preſs," you had too good an opinion of your own diſcipline to have any apprehenſions, that it could be prevented from making its way, or even be checked and diſcouraged in its progreſs by ſuch a ſlight attempt. [4] "Your friends" in the mean time "by whoſe ſuperiour judgment you "have profited on other occaſions" as well as this, thought otherwiſe: they, it ſeems, not having the ſame byaſs of ſelf-partiality in the caſe, obſerved to you, that "my ſtrictures were ſuch, as might be underſtood to "affect your work, and had made it neceſſary for you "to give them particular anſwers." It is extremely flattering to me, and, as any one may ſee from the caſt of your reply, it is not leſs provoking to you, to find, that in the opinion of ſuch judicious men, whoſe prejudices, if they had any, though not ſo ſtrong as the

A authors,

1 Conf. *additional preface*, p. vii. 2 See the date of the firſt edition, and p. 15. note. 3 Conf. addit. pref. p. vii. 4 Conf. ibid.

authors, would on the authors account, be all in favour of his performance, "[5] a pretty bulky volume of con-" troverſy," which had coſt you much time and pains, was in danger of being hurt, " by a petty" diſcourſe, " ſcarce big enough to make a" ſix-"penny pamphlet."

The ſame able and faithful friends, who even, when [6] " you were determined to paſs over my vindication in " profound ſilence," had influence enough over you to put you upon writing a large reply, which is ſtretched in the ſecond edition of your book from one end of the volume to the other, from the motto of the preface to the laſt ſentence of the poſtſcript, if they had ſeen this reply, before it came out of the preſs, would no doubt by their ſage and wholſome counſel, to which you are always ready to liſten, have moderated the heat of paſſion, which breaks out in every part of it, and have prevailed with you to leave out thoſe traits of malignity, which diſgrace the writer, and do no good to his cauſe.

But your anſwer, though perhaps not quite ſo calm, as for your ſake they might have wiſhed, is certainly as particular, as they could deſire: for there is only one or two paragraphs in my diſcourſe, which you have ſuffered to paſs without an animadverſion. In order therefore to ſee, what damage the diſcourſe has ſuffered, the beſt way will be to take the ſeveral paragraphs, into which it is divided, one by one, and to examine your animadverſions upon each of them ſeparately. This method of defence is farther recommended to me by the method, if I may call it ſo, of your reply, great part of which you have thrown into detached obſervations. From reading your title-page indeed any one would expect to find me anſwered in your *additional preface:* but this contains little more than half your anſwer; the reſt is a ſort of buſh-fighting in ſtraggling notes.

Though this letter is addreſſed to you, who are acquainted with both the editions of your own book; the manner

[5] Conf. p. 104. [6] Conf. addit. pref. p. vii.

manner of conveyance is ſuch, as will bring it into the hands of other readers, who may perhaps have ſeen only one of them: it may therefore not be improper to inform them, that, in my defence, unleſs where I give expreſs notice to the contrary, I refer to your ſecond edition, becauſe your anſwer is joined to it; but to avoid a little confuſion, which might otherwiſe have been made in ſome of your objections, the references in the diſcourſe ſtand, as they did before, and are made to the firſt.

7 "Your wiſh, that I would endeavour to underſtand "you, before I repreſent you," ſhall be complyed with: any man may do his endeavour, and I promiſe you to do my beſt. Whether I ſhall ſucceed or not, depends upon yourſelf, as much as upon me. If this wiſh was confined to the *confeſſional*, the taſk would not be very difficult: but if you extend it to the *additional preface* and the new *notes*; I ſhould be inclined to think from the manner, in which they are written, that in many inſtances you intended it as a prohibition of repreſenting you at all. For whether it is, that you wrote them in a paſſion, or that you did not take eleven years to reviſe and correct them, or that, being conſcious of the weakneſs of your reply, you endeavoured to cover it, as well as you could, by indirect hints, ambiguous expreſſions, fallacious reaſonings, and a multitude of words; they are certainly much more obſcure than your book: and it has often coſt me more trouble to find out their meaning, than to ſhew, after I had found it, that it is either futile in itſelf, or nothing to the purpoſe.

In the courſe of my defence I ſhall have occaſion ſo often to call upon you for ſhifting the queſtion, that the frequency of the charge may poſſibly incline ſome of my readers to ſuſpect, that your arguments are by ſome contrivance of mine placed in ſuch a light, as would lay you open to it. If any of them, who have not your

7 Conf. p. 117. note.

ſecond edition at hand, ſhould have ſuch a ſuſpicion, I beg leave to aſſure them, that I have not miſrepreſented you deſignedly in any one inſtance: thoſe, who have an opportunity of looking into your reply, may ſee, that I have not charged you with this trick oftener, than you have played it. When one conſiders one of your principal arts of controverſy; it is pleaſant to hear you [8] give notice ſo early in your reply, that you do not love diſtinctions: if you had met my arguments fairly, I would have humoured you in this averſion, and have taken care not to diſguſt you by uſing any. But [9] "a profeſſed diſputant," or any diſputant at all, if he knows what he is about, when he finds you upon every occaſion ſkulking behind an ambiguity, cannot waive "his privilege" of driving you out with a diſtinction.

My diſcourſe, you may remember, is a charge delivered at a viſitation to the clergy of my *archdeaconry*, though you, from ſome private regard perhaps for the character, with which it is connected, have pointed all your ſneers at *the profeſſor of divinity*: it begins thus——

I. REVEREND BRETHREN; the law of our church requires, [a] that every perſon, who is received into the miniſtry, or is admitted to any eccleſiaſtical living, ſhall acknowledge, by ſubſcribing his name, that all and every the xxxix articles of religion, agreed upon in the year 1562, by the archbiſhops and biſhops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in convocation, are agreeable to the word of God.

[a] Can. xxxvi.

[1] "We have, you ſay, certain laws of the ſtate enjoining ſubſcription, which do not require the ſeveral perſons mentioned in this canon to ſubſcribe *all* "the

[8] Conf. addit. pref. p. vii. [9] Conf. p. 40. n. [1] Conf. addit. pref. p. ix. x. xi. xii.

" the xxxix articles. The ſtatute 13 *Eliz.* c. 12. " enjoyns ſubſcription to all the articles of religion, " *which only concern the confeſſion of the true chriſtian* " *faith and the doctrine of the ſacraments*, compriſed in a " book imprinted, intituled, *Articles, &c.* as in the title " of our preſent articles." And to prove, that the act, being paſſed with this *limiting clauſe*, requires none of the clergy to ſubſcribe to any of the xxxix articles beſides the ſacramental and doctrinal ones, you alledge a converſation between archbiſhop Parker, and Peter Wentworth Eſquire, (as Sir [2] Simonds D'ewes calls him, or, as you call him after [3] Neals hiſtory, which was corrected in the ſecond edition, Sir Peter Wentworth) " in which Parker expoſtulated with him and ſome " other members of the houſe of commons, *Why they* " *did put out of the book the articles for the homilies,* " *conſecrating of biſhops, and ſuch like*, meaning," ſay you, " by the *limiting clauſe*, confining ſubſcription to " articles only of a certain tenor." You add, " that " as no other act has repealed this or in any wiſe con- " travened it, the limitation is in force to this hour." The act has indeed never been repealed, but the judgment of the legiſlature in an act of the 14*th Car.* II. *c.* 4. §. 30. has contravened [4] the ſtale and hackneyed miſconſtruction of it, which you have adopted. " Whereas the 36th article of the xxxix *agreed upon by* " *the archbiſhops and biſhops of both provinces, and the* " *whole clergy in convocation, &c.*" as in the title of our preſent articles, " is in theſe words following"—Here the article *of conſecration of biſhops and miniſters* is recited: and then " it is enacted, that all ſubſcriptions, " hereafter to be had or made to the ſaid articles by " any deacon, or prieſt, or eccleſiaſtical perſon or other " per-

2 D'ewes journals, p. 236. 3 Vindication of the government, &c. [by Madox] p. 338. Neals hiſt. of Purit. 4to. v. i. p. 189. 4 Hiſtorical eſſay on 39 artic. by Anthony Collins, c. vii. See Biog. Brit. Collins. Des Maizeauxs life of Chillingworth, note Q. p. 64—74. Neals hiſt. of Puritans, v. i. p. 179.

" perſon whatſoever, who *by this act* or *any other law in* " *force* is required to ſubſcribe unto the ſaid articles, " ſhall be applied, for and touching the ſaid 36th arti- " cle, unto the book containing the form, mentioned in " this act, as the ſame did heretofore extend unto the " book, ſet forth in the time of *Edw.* the VIth." What think you now? Is there any limiting clauſe, which leaves the 36th article *for conſecrating of biſhops* out of the 13th of *Eliz.?* Do not you allow, or rather, as you thought it ſuited your purpoſe, do not you maintain, " that [5] this act refers to 13 *Eliz.* as the *ſtanding law* " concerning ſubſcriptions?" and does not it take for granted, and proceed upon this principle, that the law, to which it refers, requires ſubſcription to this 36th article?—We may carry this argument a little farther. The 36th article *of conſecration of biſhops, &c.* is not one of thoſe, which only concern the true chriſtian faith and the doctrine of the ſacraments: the ſtatute of the 13th of *Eliz.* therefore does not limit all ſubſcriptions to articles of this tenor: for we find, that, the act of uniformity 14 *Car.* II. underſtands it to require ſubſcription to the 36th article.

Some perſons however were certainly intended to be exempted by the limiting clauſe from ſubſcribing to this and ſome other articles. From the firſt ſection of the act we may learn, who they were, and how long the exemption continued in force. It " enacts that every perſon " under the degree of a biſhop, which doth or ſhall pre- " tend to be a prieſt or miniſter of Gods holy word and " ſacraments by reaſon of any other form of inſtitution, " conſecration, or ordering, than the form ſet forth by " parliament, in the time of *Edw.* VIth, or now uſed in " the reign of our moſt gracious ſovereign lady; before " the feaſt of the nativity of Chriſt next following, ſhall " in the preſence of the biſhop, &c. declare his aſſent " and ſubſcribe *to* all the articles of religion, *which* " *only concern the confeſſion of the true faith and the doc-* " *trine*

[5] Conf. addit. pref. p. xi.

" *trine of the ſacraments*, compriſed in a book imprint-
" ed, intituled, *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the*
" *archbiſhops and biſhops of both provinces, and the whole*
" *clergy in convocation, &c*; and ſhall bring from ſuch
" biſhop, &c. a teſtimonial of ſuch aſſent and ſubſcrip-
" tion, and openly on ſome ſunday, &c. read both the
" ſaid teſtimonial and the ſaid articles, &c." Theſe words *the ſaid articles* in this firſt ſection plainly mean the articles, to which the perſons, deſcribed in it, were required to declare their aſſent and to ſubſcribe, that is, *all the articles, which only concern the confeſſion of the true chriſtian faith and the doctrine of the ſacraments.* And the perſons deſcribed, are ſuch, *as did or ſhould pretend to be prieſts or miniſters by reaſon of any other form of inſtitution, conſecration, or ordering, than the form ſet forth by parliament in the time of Edw. the* VI*th, &c.*
6 " The meaning of which, ſays Strype, is undoubted-
" ly to comprehend papiſts, and likewiſe ſuch, as re-
" ceived their orders in ſome of the foreign reformed
" churches, when they were in exile under queen *Mary*."
7 Neal agrees with him, and ſays, at the time of mak-
ing this ſtatute, " many of the clergy had been exiles
" for religion, and had been ordained abroad according
" to the cuſtom of foreign churches, but would not be
" re-ordained, any more than thoſe of the popiſh
" communion: therefore to put an end to all diſputes
" the ſtatute includes both." Now the limitation did not originally extend to all perſons, who ſhould be received into the miniſtry, or be admitted to any eccleſiaſtical benefice, as I have proved from the act of uniformity 14 *Car.* II. And ſuch perſons, as had been appointed miniſters otherwiſe than by *Edw.* the VIths ordinal, in whoſe favour it was granted, could have no benefit from it after the feaſt of the nativity next enſuing the paſſing of the act. It is therefore *not* " in
" full force to this hour," but expired about thirty two years before the canon in queſtion was made.

The

6 Strypes Annals. Vol. II. p. 71. 7 Neals hiſt. &c. p. 180.

[8] The learned Mr. *Cay* has accordingly in his abridgment of the ſtatutes omitted the whole firſt ſection as of no force or importance in the preſent times: and in the following ſections, where the articles are mentioned, he ſpeaks of them at large without taking any notice of the limiting clauſe. [9] *Collins*, who laboured in the ſame cauſe with you, has in a book, to which [1] you ſometimes refer with approbation, ſhewn himſelf to have been as able and honeſt an interpreter of law, as he was of goſpel; for he quotes the act thus; "Be it enacted, that every perſon under the degree of a biſhop, "which doth or ſhall pretend to be a prieſt or miniſter, "—ſhall declare his aſſent and ſubſcribe, &c." leaving out the deſcription of the perſons, to whom the limitation relates: and [2] *Des Maizeaux*, another writer on the ſame ſide, quotes it, as *Collins* had done before him.

We have found, that 14 *Car.* II. underſtands the ſubſcription, required by 13 *Eliz*, not to be confined to thoſe articles, which only concern the confeſſion of the true chriſtian faith, and the doctrine of the ſacraments. Let us enquire next, whether the words of 13 *Eliz.* can be ſo conſtrued as to extend to the other articles: for if they can; whatever other conſtruction they may be capable of; this, which is ſupported by the judgment of parliament, muſt be the true one. The 2d ſection begins thus; "If any perſon eccleſiaſtical, or which "ſhall have eccleſiaſtical living, ſhall adviſedly "maintain or affirm any doctrine directly contrary or "repugnant to *any of the ſaid articles, &c.*" How are we to underſtand the words, *any of the ſaid articles*, here? [3] "No others, ſay you, are meant beſides the "ſacramental and doctrinal articles: becauſe there is "no mention of the xxxix articles in the whole act." You might have found in the firſt ſection of it mention of a book imprinted, intituled, *Articles, whereupon it was agreed*

8 Cays abridg. title ſervice and ſacraments. 9 Hiſtor. eſſay, &c. printed for Franklin in 1724. p. 163. 164. 1 Conf. p. 13. n. p. 152. n. 2 Des Maizeaux's life of Chillingworth, p. 63. 3 Conf. ad. pref. p. xiii. n.

agreed, &c. which is the title of the xxxix articles, though their number is not ſpecifyed. Nay, you did find, as you tell us elſewhere, [3] "the title of theſe articles," which you had juſt before called the xxxix articles, "recognized "in the act of the 13th of *Elizabeth.*" Refer the words in queſtion to the *Articles whereupon it was agreed, &c.* as mentioned in this title, and then the law will ſtand thus——All perſons appointed miniſters, otherwiſe than by *Edward* the VIths ordinal, ſhall ſubſcribe to ſuch of the *Articles, whereupon it was agreed, &c.* as are of a certain tenor: and no eccleſiaſtical perſon, however ordained, ſhall adviſedly maintain any doctrine repugnant to *any of the ſaid Articles, whereupon it was agreed, &c.* This reference of the words gives us the true conſtruction of the act; becauſe it gives us ſuch a conſtruction of it as, agreeably to the judgment of parliament in 14 *Car.* II. enjoyns ſubſcription *to all* the xxxix articles: for in the 3d ſection it is enacted, that "no perſon ſhall hereafter be admitted to any benefice "with cure," and in the 5th, that "none ſhall be ad- "mitted to the order of deacon or miniſter, except he "ſhall firſt have ſubſcribed to *the ſaid Articles,*" that is, to the *Articles, whereupon it was agreed, &c.* taken in the ſame extent, as in the 2d ſection. When the ſtatute is thus interpreted; the canon, which requires, that "every perſon, who is received into the miniſtry, or "admitted to any eccleſiaſtical benefice, ſhall ſubſcribe "to *all and every* the xxxix articles," is plainly copied from it.

The act of uniformity 14 *Car.* II. affords ſome collateral arguments to ſupport the ſame conſtruction of the act of the 13th of *Eliz.* It enacts in the 17th ſection, that "heads of colleges, in the preſence of the "fellows and ſcholars, &c. ſhall ſubſcribe unto, and in "the 19th ſection, that lecturers in the preſence of the "ordinary ſhall read and declare their unfeigned aſſent "unto, the xxxix articles mentioned in the ſtatute made "in the 13th year of the reign of the late queen *Eliza-*

 "*beth.*"

[3] Conf. p. 216.

" *beth.*" True, ſay you, but [4] " the articles *mentioned* " in the 13th of *Elizabeth to be ſubſcribed*, are thoſe, " which only concern the confeſſion of the true chriſtian " faith and doctrine of the ſacraments." The words, *to be ſubſcribed*, are an interpolation of your own: the act ſays, " the xxxix articles mentioned in the 13th of " *Eliz.*" and, if you will let it ſpeak for itſelf, it will explain what it means by the xxxix articles, and will lead you to the place in the 13th of *Eliz.* where they are mentioned. In the 30th ſection, [5] as quoted above, it ſays, " whereas the 36th article of the xxxix " *agreed upon by the archbiſhops, and biſhops of both* " *provinces, &c.*" By the xxxix articles therefore it means the *articles agreed upon by the archbiſhops and biſhops, &c.* and the place, where it underſtands, and where you perhaps may now underſtand, the xxxix articles to be mentioned in 13 *Eliz.* is the place where " the title of them is recognized." Having thus ſhewn, that the xxxix articles mentioned in 13 *Eliz.* to which by 14 *Car.* II. heads of colleges are required to ſubſcribe, and lecturers to declare their aſſent, are the *articles agreed upon by the archbiſhops and biſhops, &c.* as deſcribed in their general title, and conſequently are all the xxxix; I will leave you to conſider, whether the legiſlature intended in this latter ſtatute to require theſe to ſubſcribe or declare aſſent to any more or any other articles, than it underſtood the former to require all perſons to ſubſcribe, who ſhould be received into the miniſtry or be admitted to an eccleſiaſtical benefice.

But we muſt not forget Wentworths ſpeech in the year 1575, in which he related to the houſe of commons what had paſſed in a converſation between himſelf and archbiſhop Parker. [6] " I was," ſays he, " amongſt others the laſt parliament ſent unto the bi- " ſhop of *Canterbury* for the articles of religion, that " then paſſed this houſe. He aſked us, why we did " put

4 Conf. ad. pref. p. xii. n. 5 See p. 5. 6 Sir Simonds D'ewes journals, &c. p. 239.

" put out of the book the articles for the homilies, " conſecration of biſhops, and ſuch like? ſurely, Sir, " ſaid I, becauſe we were ſo occupied in other matters, " that we had no time to examine them, how they " agreed with the word of God. What? ſaid he, " ſurely you miſtook the matter: you will refer your- " ſelves wholly to us therein. No, by the faith I bear to " God, ſaid I, we will paſs nothing before we under- " ſtand, what it is: for that were to make you popes. " Make you popes, who liſt, ſaid I, for we will make " you none." What ſhall we do with this converſation?—I have already ſhewn you, what cannot be done with it; you cannot uſe it as a proof, that the articles, which do not concern the confeſſion of the true chriſtian faith and doctrine of the ſacraments were left out of the ſtatute of the 13th of *Elizabeth*. And for your farther ſatisfaction I will ſhew you now, that it happened a year after this ſtatute was made.

The firſt point to be ſettled is the true date of this ſtatute, which you make to be 1571 at p. x. of your additional preface, and 1572 in the body of your book at p. 245 of your ſecond, and p. 213 of your firſt edition. There can be no room to ſuſpect an error of the preſs in either place: for in the preface you mention the date 1571 twice, and give your readers the ſecond time a ſort of caution to take notice of it; and in the book we not only find 1572 in both editions, but you take ſome pains [7] in a note to reconcile this date of the act with the date of a body of canons, " to be found " in Sparrows collection under the title of *liber cano-* " *num anno* 1571, which you ſay were not publiſhed till " the act was paſt." I muſt beg leave to ſtop you a moment, whilſt I ſhew my other readers a curioſity, which you undoubtedly are well acquainted with, as it is one of your own. We learn from the title in [8] Sparrows collection, to which you refer, that, when

 this

7 Conf. p. 246. n. 247. 8 Conf. p. 246, 247. n. Sparrows collect. p. 225.

this body of canons was made, the convocation met on the 3d day of *April* 1571, [9] and from Strypes life of Parker, to which you likewiſe refer, we learn, that "*in the ſame year* they were printed by *John Day*, and "were ſent in *July* or *Auguſt* to Grindall and recom- "mended to him for the obſervation of the clergy of his "province:" but by the help of a certain *noſtrum* called *eccleſiaſtical computation* you can ſhew, that theſe canons, publiſhed in 1571, were not publiſhed, till after an act of 1572, according to your date of it, had been paſſed by the parliament. Such a ſort of eccleſiaſtical computation, as this, will do any thing that you pleaſe: no other can reconcile your two dates of this act. For [1] "the parlia- "ment of 1571 began on the 2d of *April*, and was "diſſolved on the 29th of *May* enſuing: and the par- "liament of 1572 began on the 8th of *May*, and was "adjourned on the 30th of *June* next enſuing." The former therefore did not by any computation, but ſuch an one as yours, ſit in any part of 1572, nor the latter in any part of 1571.

As we cannot reconcile your two dates; we muſt try to determine, which of them is the true one. How ſhall we decide this difficult queſtion; Whether an act of the 13th of *Eliz.* as this is called in the ſtatute book, was made in the year 1571 or in the year 1572? Why; conſult the table of kings and queens in your almanack, and from thence you may learn, though not indeed without a calculation, that the 13th of *Eliz.* began in November 1570, and ended in November 1571. Or you may go a nearer way to work by turning to D'ewes journals, and reading the whole title, of which I have juſt now quoted a part,—— [2] "A journal of "the proceedings of the houſe of lords in the parlia- "ment holden at Weſtminſter *An.* 13 *reg. Eliz. A. D.* "1571, which began there on Monday the 2d day of "April, and then and there continued until the diſſo- "lution

9 Strypes life of Parker, p. 321, 322. 1 D'ewes journals, p. 136, 191. 2 D'ewes journals, p. 136.

" lution thereof on Tueſday the 29th day of May en-
" ſuing." The next parliament, as you may ſee [3] in the ſame journals, was holden *An.* 14 *reginæ Eliz. A. D.* 1572.

[4] You vary from yourſelf in the ſame manner about the year, in which Parkers and Wentworths converſation happened. In your book it is 1572, and in your preface 1571. They had this converſation, whilſt the parliament was ſitting, [5] as appears from Wentworths own words: and the ſeſſions both in 1571 and 1572, as we have ſeen already, began and ended at ſuch times of the year, that whatever you might be able to do by your *noſtrum*, no one elſe can reconcile your two accounts by any difference of computation. We found juſt now, that of the ſame two dates, 1571 is the true one of the act enjoyning ſubſcription: and we have Wentworths evidence, that 1572 is the true one of the converſation between Parker and him. [6] " I was," ſays he, " amongſt others the laſt parliament ſent, " &c." [7] This was ſaid in 1575: and [8] the journals will ſhew you, that the laſt parliament before this in 1575 was in 1572.

[9] *Bennet* may poſſibly have taught you to reply, that the laſt parliament before 1575 was in 1571, and that what was holden in 1572 was only a former ſeſſion of the ſame parliament, which ſat in 1575. We have no reaſon to think, that Wentworth was thus preciſe in the language of his ſpeech, when we find, that D'ewes was not in his journals, [1] in which he calls what was holden in 1572 ſometimes *a parliament*, and ſometimes *a ſeſſion of parliament*. And from Wentworths ſpeech you may collect, not only that he was not ſo exact in his expreſſions, as this reply ſuppoſes, but that by the laſt parliament he meant the laſt ſeſſion in 1572. [2] " A
" meſ-

3 D'ewes journals, p. 191. 4 Conf. p. 245. ad. pref. p. x. 5 See p. 10. 6 See p. 10. 7 D'ewes, p. 239. 8 D'ewes, p. 226, 191. 9 Bennets eſſay on 39 articles, p. 406. 1 D'ewes, p. 191, 205. 2 D'ewes, p. 238, 239, 240.

" meſſage, Mr. Speaker, was brought the *laſt ſeſſions* " into the houſe, that we ſhould not deal in any mat- " ters of religion, but firſt to receive from the bi- " ſhops.—There were divers of this houſe, who ſaid " immediately,—that God would not proſper the ſeſ- " ſion.——Well, God was the *laſt ſeſſion* ſhut out of " doors: his great indignation therefore was poured " upon this houſe; for he did put into the queens ma- " jeſtys heart to refuſe good and wholeſome laws for her " own preſervation." He then goes on to ſpeak of this refuſal, which happened *laſt ſeſſion*, as having happened *laſt parliament*.——" How could any prince more " unkindly oppoſe herſelf againſt her nobility and peo- " ple, than her majeſty did the *laſt parliament*. Did ſhe " not call it of purpoſe to prevent perils to her perſon? " —Yet—Did not her majeſty in the end refuſe all our " travels?—But was this all? No. For God would not " all *that ſeſſion* deſcend upon our biſhops.——I do " ſurely think, that the biſhops were the cauſe of that " doleful meſſage; and I will ſhew you what maketh " me to think ſo, I was amongſt others the *laſt parlia-* " *ment* ſent unto the biſhop of *Canterbury*, &c." The train of his diſcourſe connects the converſation, which then paſſed between him and the archbiſhop, in point of time with the queens refuſal of a bill paſſed by the houſe relating to Mary queen of Scots, and likewiſe with her meſſage to the houſe not to proceed in matters of religion without the advice of the biſhops. But the refuſal of that bill and the meſſage about religion are [3] by D'ewes and the journals of parliament placed in the year 1572. [4] Strype has examined into the date of this converſation, and has uſed theſe arguments to fix it in this year, as may be ſeen at large in his *annals*.

The year 1572 being the true date of the converſation between Parker and Wentworth; what we find in the journals, [5] that he was one of thoſe, " who were " ap-

3 D'ewes, p. 197, 199, 201, 202, 204, 207, 212, 213, 225.
4 Strypes annals, v. ii. p. 126, 127, 128. 5 D'ewes, p. 179.

" appointed in 1571 to attend the archbiſhop for an an-
" ſwer touching matters of religion," will, when compared with that date, only prove, that he was ſent to Parker on the ſubject of religion in two ſucceſſive parliaments, in 1571, as appears from this evidence, and in 1572, as appears from his own. [6] Strype is of opinion, that he was one of thoſe " others", mentioned in the journals, to whom " with Mr. treaſurer, Sir Thomas
" Scott and Mr. attorney of the duchy, the bill for rites
" and ceremonies in 1572 was referred."

What then were [7] " the articles of religion, which
" paſſed the houſe of commons in 1572, and for which
" Wentworth was ſent to the archbiſhop?" They were not the bill enjoyning ſubſcription to the xxxix articles; for this paſſed into a law in the preceding year 1571. But there were [8] two bills of rites and ceremonies, which in 1572 were read three times in the houſe of commons, and were afterwards dropped on the report of the treaſurer, that " the queen, who had ſignified to the houſe
" her pleaſure to ſee them, liked not well of them, or of
" the parties, that preferred them." In one of theſe bills, as far as we can gather from what was ſaid by the archbiſhop, ſome of the xxxix articles were dropped. And there is the more reaſon to believe this to be the caſe; becauſe [9] the ſame party, which had loſt this bill, did in a ſubſequent parliament 1586 make an attempt, which in reſpect of the articles was like that complained of by the archbiſhop: they brought into the houſe of commons a bill to ſupport a book, which left out three of the xxxix articles; the 34th, *of traditions*; the 35th, *of homilies*; and the 36th, *of the making of biſhops and miniſters.*

II. I do not deſign at preſent to enquire into the force and meaning of this ſubſcription, when it is applyed to theſe articles in particular,

6 Strypes an. v. ii. p. 125. Life of Parker, p. 394. D'ewes, p. 212. 7 D'ewes, p. 239. 8 D'ewes, p. 212, 213, 214. Strypes life of Parker, p. 394. 9 Neal. v. i. p. 321. D'ewes, p. 410. Strypes life of Whitgift, p. 258. Append. p. 110.

lar, but only to vindicate the general right, which the governours of our own, or of any other proteſtant, church have to enjoyn, that all thoſe, who are admitted to the office of public teaching in it, ſhall ſubſcribe to the truth of ſome confeſſion of faith and doctrines.

You commend [1] "my diſcretion, for making this de-
"claration, inſtead of undertaking the particular vin-
"dication of our own ſyſtem: becauſe, as it happens,
"we have certain laws of the ſtate, which do not re-
"quire, that every perſon, who is received into the
"miniſtry or is admitted to an eccleſiaſtical living ſhall
"acknowledge, by ſubſcribing, that *all* and *every* the
"xxxix articles are agreeable to the word, of God;
"ſo that I could not have vindicated the canon by the
"ſame arguments, which I employ to prove the gene-
"ral right, without running foul of the conſtitution
"of my country." But you do not ſeem to know, what the point is, into which I did not deſign to enquire in this diſcourſe. If you imagined it to be that, which we have juſt now been diſcuſſing, you miſtook *the force and meaning of ſubſcription* for the legal authority of the canon, which enjoyns it; the obligation ariſing from having ſubſcribed to the articles for the obligation to ſubſcribe to them. I cannot be ſaid to have declined vindicating the legality of the canon; becauſe, though the writer, who led me to employ the thoughts of my hearers on the ſubject of ſubſcriptions, had told us the old ſtory, that [2] "according to the act of 13 *Eliz.* enjoyning ſub-
"ſcription, thoſe articles are required to be ſubſcribed,
"which *only concern the confeſſion of the true faith and*
"*the ſacraments*; and had obſerved, that "the ca-
"nons of 1571, in conſequence of which the biſhops ex-
"acted ſubſcription to *all* the articles, not having been
"ratifyed in form by the royal aſſent, they had *then* no
"legal

[1] Conf. ad. pref. p. ix. [2] Conf. p. 245, 246, 247.

" legal authority to ſilence, impriſon, or deprive, as they " did, great numbers of thoſe, who refuſed to ſub- " ſcribe *their* articles;" yet he had not objected to the legal authority [3] of the canons of 1603 to bind the clergy *in re eccleſiaſtica*; and theſe, having been confirmed by the royal charter, are not liable to the only objection, which he had made to the others. Perhaps therefore, as you had not then produced your ingenious argumentation upon this ſubject, but had reſerved it for a future edition of your book; and as I have ſhewn, now you have produced it, that it has no foundation to ſupport it, but that the ſtatute, like the canon of 1603, " enjoyns ſubſcription to *all* the articles " without exception;" our readers may be apt to place it to the account of your diſcretion rather than of mine, that I did not undertake to vindicate the legality of this canon in my diſcourſe: and poſſibly before this time you may wiſh, that you had been as diſcrete in the preſent edition, as you were in the former.

But, now I have examined into this matter, I " have " not," you may ſtill ſay, " defended the legality of " the canon upon the ſame principles, which I employed " before to prove the general right" of a proteſtant church to require ſubſcriptions. Very true; I do not argue from the ſame principles, to prove the legality of a canon of our church, conſidered as a proteſtant church eſtabliſhed by civil authority, and to prove, that it has a right, when conſidered under the ſingle notion of a proteſtant church, to require its clergy to ſubſcribe to ſome confeſſion of faith and doctrines. In my charge I conſidered it merely as a proteſtant church, and ſhewed, that a right of enjoyning ſubſcription is conſiſtent with proteſtantiſm. In replying to your objection againſt the legality of the canon, I conſider it as a proteſtant church eſtabliſhed by the civil power, and ſhew the canon to be a tranſcript of an act of parliament.

You need be under no apprehenſions, [4] that, " as

[3] Burns eccleſ. law, pref. p. xii. xiii. [4] Conf. ad. pref. p. xvi. xvii.

" you allow a proteſtant church to expect a declaration " from public paſtors, that they believe the ſcriptures, " and will make them the rule of their teaching, the " account of my deſign may appear ſo looſely worded, " as to leave no matter of diſpute between you and me; " unleſs the clauſe runs thus——*Shall ſubſcribe to ſome* " SYSTEMATICAL *confeſſion of faith and doctrines.*" You I know are of opinion, [5] that " the laying aſleep " of controverſies is in effect a ſhifting nearer to po- " pery;" which may make you the more ſolicitous to have our diſpute kept awake. You have therefore my conſent to keep it as much awake, as you can, by adding the word *ſyſtematical* in your writings, wherever you ſpeak of a confeſſion: and I am the rather diſpoſed to indulge you in this odd humour, becauſe I have obſerved, that you can amuſe yourſelf very innocently with ſuch kind of words, and think them arguments. For my own part, as it does not ſeem probable to me, that you and I ſhall ever make up all our matters ſo amicably, as to ſet out together upon a pilgrimage to Rome; I am contented to let the clauſe ſtand as it was, and truſt, that every one, who is at all acquainted with our language, will know, that *a confeſſion* of faith and doctrines is a formulary containing an explicit declaration of them, and that ſuch a general declaration, as you allow proteſtant churches to expect from their public paſtors, is not in common uſage called by this name.

III. The univerſal church of Chriſt is a ſociety, which he inſtituted, and of which he is the head, including in it all thoſe, who profeſs to believe in his name, and have been received by baptiſm into the number of his diſciples. [b] The end and purpoſe, for which this ſociety was inſtituted, is to lead men to eternal life by the

5 Conf. pref. p. lxv. lxxiii.

the preſervation and advancement of true religion. It is therefore the duty of thoſe, who are appointed under him to ſuperintend and govern particular churches, which are only parts of the univerſal church, to ſecure and promote, as far as they are able, the true faith and doctrines of the goſpel.

[b] Locke on toleration. See his works, v. ii. p. 255.

Hitherto I have only been ſkirmiſhing with your forlorn hope. [6] Now you are come to "the corner-ſtone of "my argument," you bring up your heavy artillery, and begin the attack by charging me with a want of *good faith*. But the operation, however well planned, is badly executed: the ſhot is ill aimed, and flies over my head. [7] "I refer my readers," you ſay, "from my "definition of the univerſal church to Lockes letters on "toleration, v. ii. p. 255." How true this is we ſhall ſee preſently. "Such a reference," for ſo you go on, "ſeems to denote, if not, that the definition was taken "from thence, yet that it is agreeable to his ſenſe ex-"preſſed in the page referred to. A violent ſuſpicion, "that this incomparable writer would not ſubſcribe "to ſuch a definition, led you to look at this page "in the edition of 1727. But as you could find no-"thing here to the purpoſe, you made," what you very properly call, "a random ſearch, and at laſt," as luck would have it, "at page 135, you met with"—— what I did not refer to—— "the following definition; "A church is a voluntary ſociety of men joyned to-"gether of their own accord in order to the public "worſhipping of God in ſuch a manner, as they judge "acceptable to him and effectual to the ſalvation of "their ſouls. Now," ſay you, "if there is any other "definition of a church in Lockes letters on tolera-"tion, more to the learned profeſſors purpoſe, he will

 "certainly

[6] Conf. ad. pref. p. xvii. xviii. xix. [7] Conf. ibid.

" certainly be able to produce it. If there is not, it " will be incumbent upon him to reconcile *his own* de- " finition with *this*. The profeſſors GOOD FAITH " requires this of him." I cannot but admire upon this occaſion the [8] " *accuracy* of *the incomparable ex-* " *aminer* of my vindication," as every one indeed muſt, who is at all acquainted with the nature of printing. He in printing four editions of his *examination* managed the preſs ſo artfully, that, though by throwing in a reviſal between the ſecond and third, he has made the two former, of which one is in all reſpects the counterpart of the other, differ a little from the two latter, which likewiſe agree with each other to a tittle, yet if you know, where to find a word in any one of the four, you will ſeldom fail of finding it in the ſame page, and the ſame line, and the ſame part of the line in the other three; nay, in more than threeſcore inſtances the ſame battered letters, or other typographical imperfections, appear in the very ſame words in all four of them. But if this kind of management had been uſed in printing the ſeveral editions of Lockes works, or if I had told you, that I uſed the edition of 1740; yet if your eyes, when you read my charge, were ſo much dazzled with any flaſhes of reſentment, that you could not ſee on which ſide of the full ſtop the letter of reference ſtands; or if an eagerneſs to be revenged on me, for daring to write againſt the *confeſſional*, hurried you on, though you did ſee this, to call my *good faith* in queſtion; your ſearch would have been as much a random one, as it was now. The *feſcue* is ſo held out, as to point, not at the definition, which goes before, but at the ſentence, which follows it. My uſual practice is to place the letters of reference at, or near, the beginning, and not at the end, of the paſſage, to which they belong: and this rule is obſerved here. I deſigned to refer my readers to that part of Lockes letters on toleration, where he ſays, " The end of a religious ſociety " is

[8] Conf. p. 410. ad. pref. p. xxii.

" is the public worſhip of God, and by means thereof " the acquiſition of eternal life." He plainly agrees with me, that a church has an intermediate, as well as an ultimate, end in view. We agree likewiſe, that the ultimate end is the attainment of eternal life. Nor can we differ much about the intermediate end: for when he conſiders the public worſhip of God, as an end, for which a church is formed, he could not, conſiſtently with the doctrine of St. Paul and his own interpretation of it, confine his notion of the public worſhip of God to the joint exerciſe of acts of devotion, and exclude from it that ſervice, which is rendered to God by a joint endeavour to preſerve and advance true religion. [9] " When " he [Chriſt] aſcended up on high; he gave, ſays St. " Paul, ſome apoſtles, and ſome evangeliſts, and ſome " paſtors, and teachers; for the perfecting of the ſaints, " for the work of the miniſtry, for the edifying of the " body of Chriſt: till we all come, in the unity of the " faith and of the knowledge of the ſon of God, unto " a perfect man, unto the meaſure of the ſtature of the " fulneſs of Chriſt."——" He alone," ſays the learned commentator, " framing the conſtitution of his new " government by his own power and according to ſuch " rules, as he thought beſt, making ſome apoſtles, others " evangeliſts, and others paſtors and teachers, putting " thus together in a fit order the ſeveral members of his " new collected people, that each in its proper place " and function might labour for the good and increaſe " of the whole, and help to build up the body of " Chriſt." The apoſtle is here ſpeaking of that viſible body and church of Chriſt, " [1] the unity of " which, to uſe the words of the judicious Hooker, " conſiſteth in that uniformity, which all ſeveral per- " ſons belonging to it have, by reaſon of that one " Lord, whoſe ſervants they all profeſs themſelves, " that one faith, which they all acknowledge, that one " baptiſm, wherewith they are all initiated." And though

9 Epheſ. iv. 8, 11—16. and Lockes paraph. and note. [1] Hooker, b. iii. ſ. 1.

though the officers and miniſters, which Chriſt is here ſaid to have placed in it, were endued with the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, which would in time be withdrawn; yet the end, for which they were appointed, the edifying of the body of Chriſt, the bringing all to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the ſon of God, could not be different from the end, for which this body was formed.—But after all, if I was miſtaken in ſuppoſing Locke to be conſiſtent with St. Paul and with himſelf; here was no breach of *good faith*: the reference was fairly made; and my readers might judge, whether the paſſage, referred to, was to my purpoſe, or not.

Thus much for your random ſearches, and random ſhot. Let us now take a view of your random reaſonings. [2] The examiner, though he is not very ſharp-ſighted, might poſſibly ſee a reaſon, why it was not worth his while to try his ſtrength upon my definition of the univerſal church of Chriſt. I conſider particular churches as parts of this univerſal church, not becauſe my argument, but becauſe truth, required it. Far be it from me to ſuppoſe, that he ſaw the truth of the definition; [3] when he has ſhewn me, that he does not know the difference between chriſtianity and a ſociety of men profeſſing chriſtianity: but he might poſſibly ſee, that, if I had begun with defining particular churches to be voluntary ſocieties of chriſtians joyning themſelves together for the purpoſe of attaining eternal life by the preſervation and advancement of true religion, and had taken no notice at all of the univerſal church; the concluſion would have come out, juſt as it does now. [4] Theſe ſocieties, like all others, muſt have laws, and therefore muſt have legiſlators. But whoever are the legiſlators, whether the whole collective body of each ſociety, or any particular ſet of men in it, their duty is to promote and ſecure, as far as they are able, the

[2] Conf. ad. pref. viii. [3] Exam. p. 32. Second vindication, p. 26, 27. [4] Locke on toleration, p. 255.

the true faith and doctrines of the goſpel. You were not aware of this, and having ſeen, how ill it fared with your friend, were willing to avoid the rock which you thought he ſplit upon, and not to leave me any of my principles, or, in his correct expreſſion, not [5] "*to* "*concede to*" any of them, but to carry the controverſy as far back, as poſſible, and to begin with "my defini- "tion."

[6] "The firſt objection you make to it is, that it does "not inform my readers, whether this univerſal church "of Chriſt is a viſible or an inviſible church, and there- "fore wants explanation." In the next breath however you tell me, that [7] "the members of the inviſible "church are not diſcernible by any external marks or "tokens whatever; but, that in my definition, there "are two outward viſible marks, profeſſion of belief, "and reception by baptiſm, which point out the mem- "bers of this univerſal church of Chriſt, and deter- "mine it to be a viſible church." The objection therefore is anſwered to your ſatisfaction, one would hope, for you anſwer it yourſelf.

Before we go any farther, let us open our bibles, [8] "All power, ſays Chriſt to his apoſtles, is given me "in heaven and in earth; Go therefore and teach all "nations baptizing them:——he, that believeth, and "is baptized, ſhall be ſaved."——[9] "God, ſays St. "Paul, hath put all things in ſubjection under his "[Chriſts] feet, and given him to be the head over all "things to the church, which is his body." And the ſame inſpired interpreter has informed us, that an outward profeſſion, as well as an inward act of the mind, is included in that belief, which Chriſt requires;—— [1] "With the heart man believeth unto righteouſneſs, "and with the mouth confeſſion is made unto ſalva- "tion."

5 Exam. pag. 33. 5th edit. p. 32. 6 Conf. ad. pref. p. xix. 7 Conf. ibid. 8 Matt. xxviii. 19. Mar. xvi. 16. 9 Epheſ. i. 22, 23. 1 Rom. x. 10.

" tion."——From hence we learn, that all men out of all nations, who profeſs to believe in Chriſt, and are received by baptiſm into the number of his diſciples, are, by his inſtitution united into one body or ſociety, of which he is the head. This body or ſociety I call the univerſal church of Chriſt.

[2] " Now it would puzzle you extremely," you ſay, " if it were your affair, how to provide for the go-" vernment of this univerſal viſible church, otherwiſe " than by introducing an univerſal viſible governor." How far you look upon a definition copied from Chriſts declaration, as your affair, you know beſt. The alternative, which you propoſe ;——Either no univerſal church ; or a pope at the head of it ;——is a very ſerious affair to proteſtants. The ſcriptures, as we have ſeen, will not allow us to take the former part: and the papiſts will tell you the conſequence, and will thank you for it. In ſupport of this alternative ; or rather in ſupport of the popes univerſal ſupremacy ; for, that Chriſt has inſtituted an univerſal viſible church, cannot be denied ; you urge, that [3] " Chriſt the head is invi-" ſible ; we have therefore no other way of coming at " his directions for church-government, but by having " recourſe to the written record of them in the ſcrip-" tures, and you queſtion, how far they would be " deemed ſufficient to ſettle an uniformity of govern-" ment among particular churches, which being ac-" cording to the profeſſor," you ſhould have ſaid according to theſe ſcriptures, " parts of the univerſal vi-" ſible church, muſt be not only in connection with it, " but dependent upon it." This laſt clauſe has ſome ambiguity in it. When you ſay, that they muſt be not only in connection with it, but dependent upon it ; if you mean no more than to diſtinguiſh an accidental or precarious connection from ſuch an one, as it is their duty to preſerve ; I readily grant, that particular churches are thus far dependent upon the univerſal viſible

[2] Conf. ad. pref. xx. [3] Conf. ibid.

ble church; they cannot ſeparate themſelves from it, without ceaſing to acknowledge Chriſt for their Lord, to profeſs the faith, which he has preſcribed, and to initiate their members by the baptiſm, which he inſtituted; that is, without ceaſing to be chriſtian churches. But if you mean farther, that they cannot be parts of the univerſal viſible church without being obliged to receive their laws from the joynt act of the whole; this I deny. No particular church can indeed be a part of the univerſal church without being in this ſenſe dependent upon Chriſt, who is the ſupreme head of it: but no one particular church is in the ſame ſenſe dependent upon any other particular church, acting ſeparately, or upon all others acting together. The laws, which Chriſt has preſcribed to his church, are contained in the ſcriptures. If therefore the ſcriptures have given no directions for an uniformity of government throughout the univerſal church; particular churches are in this reſpect left at their liberty, and may ſettle their own form of government, as they pleaſe. If on the other hand, the ſcriptures have given ſuch directions, they are, in controverſies about church government, as well as in controverſies of faith, a ſufficient guide to all particular churches without the help of an univerſal viſible governour.

Whilſt you are introducing the pope at the front, you call off the attention of your readers from this part, by bidding them have an eye to the back-door, for fear "[4] an opening ſhould be left there, at which "he may be ſlipped in unawares." For "does not the "learned profeſſor know, that it is from an undeniable "fact, *viz.* the variance among particular churches "concerning church authority; and this abſurd and "groundleſs pretence, that particular churches are *de* "*jure* parts of the univerſal viſible church, laid toge-"ther, that the papiſts infer the neceſſity of an uni-"verſal viſible church-governour?" *Quanti eſt ſapere!*

 Truly

[4] Conf. ad. pref. xxi.

Truly the profeſſor, whom you are pleaſed ſo frequently and with ſuch a ſingular civility to call a *learned* one, knew ſo little of the matter, before you undertook to teach him, as to think, that the latter of theſe two principles, being founded on the declaration of Chriſt, is not an abſurd and groundleſs pretence; that the papiſts from this and the former laid together neither can nor attempt to infer the neceſſity of an univerſal viſible governour of the church; that they have for this purpoſe added a third, the inſufficiency of ſcripture to determine controverſies in religion; and that this third is the falſe principle, which makes their inference falſe. When therefore you enquire [5] "by what means ſhall "the ſuperintendents or particular governours, who "differ ſo widely concerning their authority and ap- "pointments, be brought into order without the ſuper- "intendency of an univerſal viſible governour?" if he had been left to himſelf, and had not been favoured with your inſtruction; his learning, ſuch as it was, would have led him in the firſt inſtance to bid you ſearch the ſcriptures. But ſhould the papiſts, or you for them, reply, that the ſcriptures have left the point undetermined; he would anſwer farther, that [6] the ſcriptures are ſufficient to determine all points in religion, which are neceſſary to be determined: if therefore they are ſufficient to determine this point; however they may by the perverſeneſs of men be not always effectual; the reply is not true; if on the other hand they are not ſufficient, there is no occaſion to determine it. In either caſe, the ſuperintendency of an univerſal viſible governour, to bring all churches to an agreement concerning it, is not neceſſary.

You may perhaps by this time begin to perceive, that Lockes is a definition of a particular church, and that it preſuppoſes an univerſal church, of which particular churches are parts. [7] "A church, he ſays, is a volun- "tary

5 Conf. ad. pref. xxi. 6 Chillingworth, i. 7. 7 See above at p. 19.

" tary ſociety of men, &c." If he deſigned, as the whole tenor of his diſcourſe ſhews he did, to define a chriſtian church; he muſt mean a voluntary ſociety of chriſtian men: for, a voluntary ſociety of jews or mahometans, " uniting of their own accord for the pub-" lic worſhip of God," is not a chriſtian church. But if the ſeveral members of any one ſuch voluntary ſociety, as he ſpeaks of, are conſidered as chriſtians in common with all others, who are not of the ſame voluntary ſociety with themſelves; they all acknowledge one Lord, profeſs one faith, are initiated by one baptiſm, and are therefore all members of that one viſible body, of which Chriſt is the head. But whatever church Locke intended to define, you could, if there was occaſion, find popery in his definition, as well as in mine.——" A *voluntary* ſociety of men uniting to-" gether of their own accord!"—There can be no ſuch thing as a voluntary ſociety without *free-agency*. And you ſee [8] " great reaſon to apprehend, that by opening " a door to *free-agency*, it will be impoſſible to prevent " *purgatory*, *ſaint-worſhip*, *indulgences*, *&c.* from break-" ing in along with it."

From my definition [9] of the univerſal church, you proceed to conſider the end and purpoſe, for which this ſociety was inſtituted. The immediate end, as I have ſhewn you from St. Pauls epiſtle to the Epheſians, is the preſervation and advancement of true religion. [1] " I grant, ſays Chillingworth, that Chriſt founded a " viſible church ſtored with all helps neceſſary to ſal-" vation, particularly with means to beget and conſerve " faith, to maintain unity, &c. For all theſe purpoſes " he gave at the beginning apoſtles, prophets, evan-" geliſts, paſtors, and doctors, who by word of mouth " taught their contemporaries, and by writings (wrote " indeed by ſome, but approved by all of them) taught " their chriſtian poſterity to the worlds end, how all

 " theſe

8 Conf. p. 287. 9 Conf. ad. pref. xxii. 1 Chillingworth, i. 7.

" theſe ends, and that, which is the end of all theſ " ends, ſalvation, is to be atchieved."

But you never enquire what grounds any opinion may have in ſcripture and reaſon; you only ſearch into conſequences. In this province your genius has the beſt opportunities of exerting itſelf: by putting in or leaving out premiſes, or by the help of an ambiguous word or two, you can draw what conſequences you pleaſe from any opinion whatever; and can repreſent either Chriſt or St. Paul as abettors of popery. We have juſt now ſeen an inſtance of your dexterity in the management of premiſes; you here ſhew yourſelf to be no leſs dexterous in the art of applying an ambiguous word. With the help of that " exact logician" the examiner, you have contrived ſuch a ſyllogiſm, as will force St. Paul, and all others, who venture to affirm upon his authority, that Chriſt has founded an univerſal church for the preſervation and advancement of true religion, to acknowledge communion with the church of Rome to be neceſſary to ſalvation.

The major propoſition, with the proof of it, if any ſhould be wanted, you deliver as your own. [2] " A ſo- " ciety *inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf* for the end and pur- " poſe of leading men to eternal life, implies, that no " man can attain eternal life, except he is a member " of this ſociety; or, that to be in communion with " this ſociety is neceſſary to ſalvation: becauſe other- " wiſe we muſt ſay, that Chriſt inſtituted a ſociety for " an end and purpoſe, that might be brought about " without it." Give me leave in paſſing to remind you, that Chriſt in conſequence of that [3] " power, which " was given him in heaven and in earth," inſtituted the following rule; [4] " He, that believeth, and is bap- " tized, ſhall be ſaved." Now a rule inſtituted by Chriſt for the purpoſe of leading men to eternal life, whether we conſider them as united into one viſible ſociety, or not, implies, that the obſervance of it is neceſſary

[2] Conf. ad. pref. xxii. [3] Matt. xxviii. 18. [4] Mark xvi. 16.

ceſſary to ſalvation: becauſe otherwiſe we muſt ſay, that he inſtituted a rule for a purpoſe, which might be brought about without it. Whatever tacit exceptions therefore this rule will admit of in favour of thoſe, who never heard of Chriſt, or of any others in extraordinary circumſtances, your major propoſition will admit of the ſame: and under whatever reſtrictions this propoſition is to be underſtood, the ſame reſtrictions will enter into your concluſion.

The minor you borrow from the examiner, who "has "ſhewn," you ſay, "that the church of Rome, as well "as other particular churches, is a part of this ſociety, "which is an univerſal viſible church."

Then comes the conſequence: "Therefore to be in "communion with the church of Rome is neceſſary to "ſalvation." The misfortune is, that this conſequence had been explained, and the fallacious uſe of the word *communion* in it had been ſhewn, many years before you and the examiner had laid your heads together to find it out. Proteſtants may joyn with the church of Rome in acknowledging Jeſus Chriſt to be their Lord, in profeſſing the ſame faith in him, and in initiating their members with the ſame baptiſm, as to the eſſentials of it; that is, they may have theſe things in common with it, or may be thus far in communion with it; and yet reject its ſuperſtitious and idolatrous worſhip, the ſupremacy and infallibility of the pope, the doctrines of tranſubſtantiation, the maſs, purgatory, indulgences, &c. [5] "So far, as lawfully we may," ſays Hooker, "we have held, and do hold fellowſhip with them [the "church of Rome.] For even as the apoſtle doth ſay "of Iſrael, that they are in one reſpect enemies, but "in another beloved of God; in like ſort with Rome "we dare not communicate concerning ſundry her groſs "and grievous abominations; yet touching thoſe main "parts of chriſtian truth, wherein they conſtantly ſtill "perſiſt, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the fa-

"mily

5 Hookers eccleſ. pol. iii. 1.

" mily of Chriſt." [6] " Not only not from the catholic " church," ſays Chillingworth to the jeſuit, " but not " ſo much as from the Roman did proteſtants ſeparate " *per omnia*; but only in thoſe practices, which they " conceived ſuperſtitious or impious. If you would at " this time propoſe a form of liturgy, which both ſides " hold lawful, and then they would not joyn with you " in this liturgy, you might have ſome colour then to " ſay, they renounce your communion abſolutely. But " as things are now ordered, they cannot joyn with you " in prayers, but they muſt partake with you in un- " lawful practices: and for this reaſon they *(not abſo-* " *lutely, but thus far)* ſeparate from your communion." Such [7] diſtinctions, as theſe, of holding fellowſhip with the church of Rome ſo far as lawfully we may, and yet not communicating with it concerning its groſs and grievous abominations; of ſeparating from it, not *per omnia*, but only in its ſuperſtitious and impious practices, not abſolutely, but only thus far; " though they " may paſs with applauſe for ſound and ſcientific in the " ſchools," where Hooker and Chillingworth were ſo unfortunate as to be educated; are the bane of all random diſputation, and therefore you and the examiner never attend to them.

But [8] " the profeſſor declares here, that *every parti-* " *cular church is a part of the univerſal viſible church in-* " *ſtituted by Chriſt himſelf.*"——And you catch him ſomewhere elſe declaring, " that *each particular pro-* " *teſtant church holds its religion independently of* ALL " *others.*" " One of theſe propoſitions muſt," you ſay, " on the mere conſideration of *ſelf-conſiſtency* be either " *retracted* or *quibbled away.*" How, in the name of grammar and common ſenſe, did you underſtand the latter of them? A man, whoſe learning reaches one ſtep beyond the alphabet, could not without a quibble, or ſomething worſe, ſuppoſe it to be at variance with the

6 Chillingworth, iii. 11. 7 Conf. ad. pref. p. xiii. 8 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxv.

the former. Though each particular proteſtant church holds its religion independently of *all other* particular proteſtant churches; yet every particular church is a part of the univerſal church inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf. Though each particular family in a ſtate manages its affairs independently of *all other families*, yet every one of them is a part of the ſtate. Though each individual in one of Lockes voluntary ſocieties holds his religion independently of *all the other* individuals, yet each of them is a part of the ſociety. Will inſtitution by Chriſt, think you, make any difference in the caſe? It will indeed make ſuch a neceſſary connection of each particular church with the univerſal church, or, if you like the expreſſion better, will [9] create ſuch a dependence of each upon it, that none of them can ſeparate from it without ceaſing to be a chriſtian church: but it creates no ſuch dependence of one particular church upon another, that whatever religious tenets or practices are received by one, every other, or any other, is therefore obliged to receive the ſame. [1] "The indiſpoſition "of any one church to reform herſelf is, and ought to "be," ſays Hooker, "no ſtay to others from per-"forming this duty to God: even as deſire of retain-"ing conformity with her would be no excuſe, if they "did not perform that duty." And if any one church ſhould ſo far corrupt itſelf, as to ſeparate entirely from the univerſal church and ceaſe to be a chriſtian church; though it would be accountable to Chriſt the ſupreme head of all; yet it would not be accountable to any other particular church, nor to all the reſt taken together, for having done ſo.

When you tell the proteſtant diſſenters, that [2] "on "this principle of independency all idea of ſchiſm will va-"niſh away of courſe;" you teach them to expect more from the latter of theſe two propoſitions, than it will perform. I cannot ſay, what may become of your idea;

9 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxiv. 1 Hooker, iii. 1. 2 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxv.

idea; becauſe I do not know what it is. But Chillingworth defines ſchiſm to be [3] "a cauſeleſs ſeparation of "one part of the church from another:" his idea therefore, notwithſtanding the independency of each part, will remain the ſame. And from a better author, than Chillingworth, you may learn, that it is poſſible for them, [4] "who are free, to uſe their liberty for a "cloak of maliciouſneſs."

[5] "Before you proceed any farther, you deſire to be "informed; who they are, that are appointed under "Chriſt to ſuperintend and govern particular churches; "and how they come by their appointment. The "vindicator does not ſay they are appointed BY Chriſt, "but UNDER Chriſt: and this," according to your interpretation, "implies, that their appointment is con-"veyed to them from Chriſt through ſome medium." Whereas the vindicator, if he may be allowed to interpret his own words, meant neither more nor leſs, than they clearly expreſs, that theſe ſuperintendents and governours are appointed in ſubordination to Chriſt.

I will tell you another ſecret. The nature of the office, to which church governours are appointed, is [6] "the "foundation of thoſe rights, which the profeſſor vindi-"cates to them;" and not, as you ſuppoſe, "*appoint-*"*ment under Chriſt.*" And in ſpeaking of their appointment he added this limitation, *under Chriſt*, to prevent cavillers from repreſenting him as ſetting up any viſible governours independent of Chriſt, [7] "whom "God gave to be the head over all things to the church, "which is his body;" any other ſort of rulers to [8] "take "the overſight of the flock, and watch for the ſouls" of thoſe, who are under their care, but ſuch as in the diſcharge of their office are ſubject to his laws, and "muſt give an account to the chief ſhepherd, when he "ſhall appear." You had better therefore have been [9] as "candid as the examiner, and have given me credit

"for

3 Chillingworth, v. 51. 4 1 Pet. ii. 16. 5 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxvi. 6 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxviii. xxix. 7 Epheſ. i. 22, 23. 8 1 Pet. v. 1—4. Heb. xiii. 17. 9 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxx.

" for the appointment," than have raiſed ſuch difficulties about it, as only ſerve to ſhew, that you undertook to anſwer my diſcourſe without knowing the principle, from which I argue.

But [1] " ſince the governours themſelves, as well as " the churches they ſuperintend, are viſible; their ap- " pointment ſhould be viſible too: and you would will- " ingly be informed, how the governours of proteſtant " churches can make *their appointment under Chriſt* ap- " pear to the ſatisfaction of the churches to be go- " verned." If you allow, what [2] you ſometimes ſeem diſpoſed to deny, that Chriſt, though he is inviſible, is the ſupreme head of the viſible church, you need not enquire, how they make *their appointment under Chriſt*, but only how they make *their appointment*, appear: for they cannot be appointed otherwiſe than *under him*. In a dedication prefixed to ſome remarks on Dr. Powells ſermon, the ſeveral pleas are ſet forth, with which ſuch clergymen, as renounce their ſubſcription, and yet keep their preferments, ſatisfy their conſciences. You there ſay;—I aſk pardon, the remarker ſays, That amongſt theſe [3] " holding-in" clergy, as you would call them, [4] " there are ſome, who think, that " with reſpect to their miniſterial calling, there is an " obligation upon them to the ſupreme Lord of the " harveſt, prior to all ſtipulations with any particular " church. They conſider themſelves as called to, and " placed in, their ſtations by the providence of God." They, who make uſe of this plea, " on the mere conſi- " deration of ſelf-conſiſtency," cannot require, that church-governours ſhould have a viſible appointment: unleſs they can ſhew, that the office of public teaching in a viſible church, and the right to the temporal emoluments annexed to this office, are ſo different from a right of governing ſuch a church, that, though the former is conveyed by the call of providence alone,

[1] Conf. ad. pref. p. xxvi, xxvii. [2] Conf. ad. pref. p. xx.
[3] Conf. pref. p. xxxii. [4] Rem. on Dr. P. ſerm. dedic. p. xvii.

there muſt in order to convey the latter be an external appointment, as well as an inviſible call. But from the contempt, with which [5] you ſpeak of caſuiſts and all their works, we may be ſure that you have no occaſion for any of their *untempered morter*. And the remarker lays before his readers only what "he has been able to "gather from the different accounts, which others "have given of themſelves," the ſlimzy caſuiſtry, by which others ſatisfy their conſciences, and not the principle, by which in theſe circumſtances he would regulate his own conduct. No want of ſelf-conſiſtency therefore can be objected to you or to him, if either of you ſhould refuſe to give church-governours credit for an inviſible appointment. But when you demand a viſible one, you are not fighting againſt the argument, which I alledge, in ſupport of the right of church-governours to require ſubſcriptions; you are only beating the air. However wide the foundations of this argument are laid; I never thought of extending it to any ſuch, as ſhould claim to be church-governours without being able to produce an external evidence of their appointment. Nor is it in the mean time confined to ſuch, as are appointed by the laying on of hands. For whatever my own opinion may be about this method of deſignation; if nothing elſe is conſidered beſides making the appointment appear, a great variety of methods might be invented: and even if the power of governing in any particular church is veſted in the whole body of the ſociety; uſe and practice is in this caſe ſuch an external evidence, as will, though there ſhould be no other, ſufficiently ſhew, that it is veſted there.

[6] "Some," you ſay, "tell us, that church-governours "receive their appointment under Chriſt by way of "ſucceſſion from the apoſtles. But this in your opi-"nion will hardly paſs with proteſtants, who conſider, "that the ſame thing is pretended in aſſerting the pleni-"tude

5 Conf. p. 97, 98. n. Conf. ad. pref. p. xxviii.

" tude of papal power."——*Nunquam accedo, quin abs te abeam doctior.* The abettors of papal power had been always repreſented to me before as pretending, [7] that one of the apoſtles had a ſupremacy of juriſdiction over the reſt; and that the pope alone is the ſucceſſor of this one apoſtle, and derives from him, in virtue of this ſucceſſion, an infallibility in judging of controverſies, and a ſupremacy over the whole church. Theſe pretences, till you informed me otherwiſe, ſeemed to me to be very different from what ſome proteſtants have ſuppoſed, that from ſome or other of the apoſtles, no one of whom had any ſupremacy over the reſt, an uninterrupted ſucceſſion of co-ordinate and fallible church-governours, reaching down to their own times, has been derived. Whatever your notions of toleration might lead you to; Locke, as your readers would have ſeen, if you had not ſuppreſſed part of what he ſays on this ſubject, [8] " conſents that ſuch proteſtants, " as theſe, ſhould have rulers in their church, whether " *biſhops* or *preſbyters*, eſtabliſhed by as long a ſeries " as they may judge neceſſary; if they on the other " hand would leave him at liberty to joyn himſelf to " any other, in which he could find whatever, accord- " ing to his own perſuaſion, is neceſſary to the ſalva- " tion of his ſoul: becauſe in this manner eccleſiaſtical " liberty would be preſerved, and no man would have " a legiſlator impoſed upon him, but whom himſelf " had choſen." It is of no importance, in the preſent queſtion, to enquire; whether there are any proteſtant churches, in which ſuch a ſucceſſion has in fact been kept up; or, if there are, whether in right any regard ſhould be paid to it. My argument depends upon the nature of the office of church-governours, and not upon the origin of it: whether their office is created by the ſociety, over which they preſide, or is derived from the apoſtles; the immediate end of it is the pre-

7 Rhemiſh teſtam. Luk. xxii. 31. n. Bellarm. de verbo Dei L. iii. c. 5. 8 Locke. v. ii. p. 254.

ſervation and advancement of true religion; and therefore it is their duty to promote and ſecure, as far as they are able, the true faith and doctrines of the goſpel. Nor do I ſee, how it was to your purpoſe, to introduce this opinion of ſome proteſtants, when you were enquiring, [9] "by what means the governours of "proteſtant churches can make their appointment ap-"pear to the ſatisfaction of the churches to be go-"verned;" unleſs you thought, what no one elſe ever heard of, that they, who ſuppoſe a ſucceſſion of church-governours to have been continued down from the apoſtles to their own times without interruption, ſuppoſe them to come into their office without any viſible appointment. I ſhould therefore have taken no notice of what you ſay on this ſubject; if it had not been a proper ſpecimen of your profound inſight into the ſtate of the controverſy between proteſtants and papiſts; of your enlarged way of thinking in reſpect of thoſe proteſtants, from whom you differ; of your perfect acquaintance with the opinions, which they hold; of your nice diſcernment in ſelecting ſuch topics, as are to your purpoſe; and of your *good faith* in quoting authorities.

[1] The examiner, who, though he knows nothing of *definitions and diſtinctions*, has not his equal, where only *common ſenſe* is concerned, ſaw and [2] "granted, that it "is a duty incumbent on all the members of every "particular church, whatever office they may, or may "not, bear in the ſame, to ſecure and promote, as far "as they are able, the true faith and doctrine of the "goſpel." But his common ſenſe could carry him no farther. [3] He did not perceive, till I ſhewed him, that this general duty is divided into ſeveral branches ſuited to the different ſtations, in which different perſons are placed; and that "in every particular church, "as in all other ſocieties, the ſtation of the governours "makes

9 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxvii. xxviii. 1 Conf. ad. pref. p. vii.
2 Exam. p. 33. 3 Exam. ibid. Sec. vindic. p. 28.

" makes it their duty to take care, that the other mem-
" bers of it, in their reſpective ſtations and callings,
" advance the proper ends of it by the proper and le-
" gitimate means." I will however do him the juſtice to ſay, that, when this was ſhewn him, he underſtood it ſo clearly, and was ſo fully convinced by it, that he did not attempt to make the leaſt reply [4] " in the *incompa-*
" *rable* letter," which he afterwards publiſhed.

You take the matter up, where " this *maſterly* " writer" found reaſon to drop it. But you have given him his revenge, for pretending to be wiſer than he is, by ſetting out with a blunder. [5] " The peculi-
" arity of the duty of church-governours depends,
" you ſay, on the nature and circumſtances of their
" appointment." You miſtake their appointment for their office. The nature of the office, to which they are appointed, without conſidering the circumſtances of their appointment, diſtinguiſhes their duty from the duty of others, who are not in the ſame office. But ſtill [6] " a general duty incumbent on every chriſtian
" man, though it was not what the profeſſor wanted,
" was as much as he could demand: for as he had *li-*
" *mited* the duty, even with reſpect to church gover-
" nours, by theſe words, *as far as they are able*, he
" could not ſafely deny, that it was *equally* the duty of
" every chriſtian man, who ſhould have abilities *equally*
" with a church-governour, to ſecure and promote the
" true religion of Chriſt." The *Stoics* argued about ſins much in the ſame manner you do about duties. They, becauſe all tranſgreſſions of the law are equally ſins, concluded, that all ſins are equal. And you, becauſe it is equally the duty of all chriſtian men, who have equal abilities, to ſecure and promote the true religion of Chriſt, conclude, that their duties, whatever difference there may be in their reſpective ſtations, are the ſame.

The

[4] Conf. p. 410. n. [5] Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxi. [6] Conf. ibid.

The *limit*, or, as I ſhould ſay, if I might take the liberty to correct an expreſſion of yours, the extent of every mans duty depends upon his abilities: he is obliged, whatever his ſtation may be, to diſcharge the duty of it to the utmoſt of his power. But what his duty is, or what branch of a common duty is peculiar to him, depends upon his ſtation. It is the duty of the civil magiſtrate to ſecure the peace and promote the welfare of the ſtate, as far as he is able. You may, if you pleaſe, conclude from hence, that it is *equally* the duty of every member of the ſtate, who has abilities *equally* with the civil magiſtrate, to ſecure and promote the ſame ends: but if you would conclude farther, that the duty of the magiſtrate and of every other member of the ſtate is the ſame; as the caſt of your argument ſhews it to be borrowed from the *Stoics*, ſo your man of abilities, will be like their wiſe man;

——————— *Dives, qui ſapiens eſt,*
Et ſutor bonus, et ſolus formoſus, et eſt rex.

Though he is only a cobler, yet, on your principles, becauſe he is a member of the ſtate, his part in the common duty of ſecuring and advancing the general good, is the ſame, as if he were a king. And in like manner, though in the church of Chriſt, he is one of thoſe, to whom the apoſtle would ſay——— [7] "Obey "them, that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your-"ſelves; for they watch for your ſouls, as they, that "muſt give an account;" yet, becauſe he is a chriſtian, in the duty of ſecuring and promoting true religion his part is the ſame, according to you, as theirs, to whom the ſame apoſtle ſays; [8] "Take heed unto yourſelves, "and to all the flock, over which the holy Ghoſt hath "made you overſeers, to feed the church of God, "which he hath purchaſed with his own blood."

IV. If Chriſts kingdom had been of this world, and had had no other view, but to eſtabliſh

7 Heb. xiii. 17. 8 Acts. xx. 28.

eſtabliſh itſelf in peace and quiet amongſt the other kingdoms of the earth by engaging mankind in an outward profeſſion of his religion; temporal rewards and puniſhments might have been as effectual means, as any, for obtaining its purpoſe. But the bare profeſſing of ourſelves to be his diſciples, whilſt we are here, will not lead us to eternal life hereafter: [c] confeſſion with the mouth is then only made unto ſalvation, when the heart believeth unto righteouſneſs. I am therefore as ready to allow, as any one can be to contend, that [d] temporal rewards and puniſhments, which can only influence a mans outward behaviour, but cannot convince his underſtanding, which may make him an hypocrite, but have no natural tendency to make him a ſincere chriſtian, are not the proper means of promoting true religion; and are therefore ſuch means, as the governours of the church have no right to make uſe of for the attainment of that end, to which the ſociety, wherein they preſide, and the office, which they bear in it, are ultimately referred.

c Rom. x. 10. d Locke ut ſup. Confeſſional. p. 22, 23.

9 "If the church of England has a right to fix her "own terms of communion, and, in conſequence of "that, to ſecure the obedience of her members by "temporal rewards and penalties," you can infer from this ſuppoſition, "that the church of Portugal muſt "have an equal right to ſecure herſelf by the diſcipline "of an *holy office*." But if, as I readily allow, temporal rewards and penalties are not the proper means of promoting true religion, and are therefore ſuch means, as

9 Conf. p. 28, 29.

as no church-governours have a right to make uſe of for the purpoſe of leading men to eternal life; What becomes of your inference? When you found, that your meaſures were thus diſconcerted, and that in a diſpute with me on the ſubject of ſubſcriptions it would be ridiculous to talk of the diſcipline of an *holy office*, you might well cry out——[1] "*Who thanks the doctor* "*for this conceſſion?*"

Something however muſt be done in order to re-eſtabliſh your diſputation on the old footing: for without an inquiſition you are nobody. The amount of this ſomething is, that [2] "the doctor has not allowed, "that church-governours have no right of fixing terms "of communion by temporal rewards and puniſh-"ments." In ſo many words indeed he has not, but in reality he has, granted this and more. He claims no rights for church-governours, but ſuch, as are derived from their duty of ſecuring and promoting true religion, which is the immediate end, in order to lead men to eternal life, which is the ultimate end, of the ſociety, over which they preſide, and of the office, which they bear in it; he allows, that temporal rewards and puniſhments are not the proper means of bringing about the immediate end; and from hence he infers, that they have no right to make uſe of them for the attainment of the ultimate end. You muſt have more ſkill, than he pretends to; if, when he argues from ſuch a principle, and makes ſuch a conceſſion, you can find any room for church-governours to claim a right of uſing temporal rewards and puniſhments, either to fix terms of communion for the people in general, or to enforce ſubſcription to an eſtabliſhed confeſſion on thoſe in particular, who are candidates for the office of public teaching.

When you think it for your purpoſe, you underſtand, that [3] "a reference denotes what the writer ſays, either "to be taken from the paſſage referred to, or at leaſt "to

[1] Conf. p. 29. n. [2] Conf. ibid. [3] Conf. ad. pref. p. xviii.

" to be agreeable to the ſenſe expreſſed there." But, when I make the conceſſion in queſtion, I refer to your *confeſſional* and to Locke on toleration: and I could not allow what you and he contend for, without allowing, that " no church has a right to fix terms of com- " munion by temporal rewards and penalties," and that " in a ſociety, the end of which is" the ſecuring and promoting true religion, " and by means thereof " the acquiſition of eternal life, all diſcipline ought to " tend to that end, and no force ought to be made uſe " of on any occaſion whatſoever." What therefore could prevent you from underſtanding my conceſſion; unleſs in your [4] " random ſearch" you could not find, what Locke contends for; and did not know, what you contend for yourſelf?—So much for *burning inquiſitions*. Thoſe of *the ſtarving ſort* ſhall be conſidered preſently.

V. The only legitimate means, of advancing and preſerving the true religion of Chriſt, are [e] inſtructions in the faith and doctrines, which he, and his apoſtles in his name, delivered to mankind, with exhortations and admonitions to attend to them, to embrace them, to perſevere in them, and by a pious and virtuous life and converſation to bring forth the proper fruits of them. Since therefore it is the duty of church-governours to take care, that the people ſhould be inſtructed in the truth of the goſpel; they have a right to require, that all thoſe, whom they appoint to be paſtors and teachers, ſhould firſt give them ſufficient aſſurance of the ſoundneſs of their faith and doctrines. This is all, that they do, when they require them to ſubſcribe to an eſtabliſhed con-

 feſſion:

[4] Conf. ad. pref. p. xviii.

feſſion: for no church has a right to make uſe of its confeſſion as a law, to compel the candidates for holy orders to aſſent to the propoſitions contained in it, but only as a teſt to diſcover, whether they do aſſent to them or not.

[e] Locke, ibid.

The examiner, upon being told, [5] that this propoſition,——*It is the duty of church-governours to appoint paſtors and teachers*,——[6] which he invents for me, and deſcants upon, with his uſual acuteneſs, through five pages, is not the ſame with mine,——*It is the duty of church-governours to take care, that the people ſhould be inſtructed in the truth of the goſpel*,——found himſelf at a ſtand, and was as ſilent upon this head, in his *incomparable* letter, as he was about the peculiar duty of church-governours. You ſaw his diſtreſs, and, though you could not help him to eſtabliſh that ſubſtitution, with which, [7] in his former performance, he had figured in ſyllogiſm, adviſe him to look me in the face once more, and to call upon me [8] "to explain, "what I mean by limiting *a common duty* to *particular* "*ſtations*." For this purpoſe you have drawn [9] interrogatories, on which, you tell him, he has a right to examine me. But if he was left to himſelf, he has too much prudence to let his vanity engage him in any ſuch hazardous ſervices. For when an *anſwer* to my ſecond vindication was expected, he publiſhed nothing but a letter *occaſioned* by it: and whoever will be at the trouble of reading this *incomparable* letter, may ſee, that he took care not to let the *contents* go an hairs breadth, beyond what he had profeſſed in the *title*. One does not know indeed, what wonderful effects your flattery and his vanity together may in time produce: they have already encouraged him [1] to tell his name and place of

5 Second vindic. p. 25, 26. 6 Exam. p. 35—40. 7 Exam. p. 36, 37. 8 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxii. xxxiii. 9 Conf. ibid. [1] See An examination of an eſſay on eſtabliſhments, &c.

of abode, and, in advertiſing his letter, to call it an *anſwer*, in ſpite of its title and contents. If ever he ſhould venture ſo far as to examine me upon your interrogatories; I will tell him one, which, if you had thought of it, would have been worth them all. You might have ſpared the reſt; if you had firſt aſked yourſelf, whether the fact, as you ſtate it, is true? whether it is the whole of a common duty, or only one particular branch of it, which I limit to the ſtation of church-governours? Till this is anſwered, I ſhall doubt about his right to aſk the others, and therefore ſhall paſs them over.

But to the queſtions, which you aſk both in your own name and his, I anſwer as follows: though not without begging pardon of my other readers for detaining them; if they ſhould happen to think, as poſſibly they may think, that theſe are as little worth notice, as the others. [2] "*We* ſhall deſire," ſay you, "in "the firſt place to know, what the profeſſor means by "the word *ſecure*, when applied to the faith and doc- "trines of the goſpel?" [3] Sometimes you deſpiſe definitions; and common ſenſe is all in all with you: but here, though common ſenſe would have guided any one elſe, you are at a loſs for want of a definition. I will try a middle way, and endeavour to make you underſtand my meaning by the help of ſome ſynonymous words. *To ſecure*, is to guard, to ſupport, to preſerve.——But you "requeſt to be informed againſt *what* that faith "and thoſe doctrines *want* to be *ſecured?*" Againſt being miſunderſtood and miſrepreſented by the injudicious and perverſe.—— "Are they not then, with reſpect to "their being recorded, full as well ſecured in the ſcrip- "tures, as in any peculiar archives of church-gover- "nours?" When the guarding of the ſcriptures againſt miſinterpretation is the point in hand; this queſtion is impertinent.—— "In reſpect therefore to their "impreſſions on the mind and intellect, can church-go-

 "vernours

[2] Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxiv. xxxv. [3] Conf. ad. pref. p. vii.

" vernours by any peculiar power ſecure more than the " outward profeſſion of them?" They may, by taking care, that the people ſhould be inſtructed in them by their public paſtors.—— " May not the duty of ſe- " curing the faith and doctrines of the goſpel, when ap- " propriated to church-governours, end in the long run " in the application of a ſort of means, nearly related " to *a cardinals hat* and an *inquiſition*; and more parti- " cularly, if the religious ſocieties they govern are in- " ſtituted upon the plan of *every other* ſociety?" You mean, I preſume, an inquiſition without temporal penalties: for church-governours, as we have ſeen before, have no right to inflict any. As to the ſameneſs of the plan, upon which churches and all other ſocieties are inſtituted; and the appropriating to church-governours the duty of ſecuring the faith and doctrines of the goſpel; theſe are mere fool-traps. Neither the end and purpoſe, for which religious and civil ſocieties are inſtituted, nor the legitimate means of promoting and ſecuring their reſpective ends and purpoſes are the ſame. Thus far therefore they are not inſtituted upon the ſame plan. But in both ſorts it is the common duty of all the members to promote and ſecure the end of the inſtitution, in ſuch a manner as is ſuitable to the ſtation, in which they are placed: and in both of them the branch of this duty, appropriated to the ſtation of the governours, is to take care, as far as they are able, that the ſeveral other members in their reſpective ſtations diſcharge theirs. Thus far therefore the plans of both are alike: and though [4] Locke has ventured to argue from " this analogy between churches and *every ſociety* inſti- " tuted for temporal ends and purpoſes;" his principles, whatever may happen *in the long run*, have not yet ended in *an inquiſition*: for which reaſon I am under no apprehenſions about the event of mine, when I argue from the ſame analogy. The common duty of all

[4] Lockes works, v. ii. p. 254. compare Confeſ. ad. pref. p. xxxiii. xxxv.

all chriſtians is to ſecure and promote, as far as they are able, the true faith and doctrines of the goſpel in ſuch a manner, as is ſuitable to their reſpective ſtations. The only legitimate means of diſcharging this duty, is by inſtructions, exhortations, and admonitions. And the particular branch of it, which I limit to the ſtation of church-governours conſiſts in taking care, that the public paſtors and teachers duly make uſe of theſe means by inſtructing the people in the truth of the goſpel. From this duty I infer the right of the governours to require thoſe, who are appointed public paſtors and teachers, to give them ſufficient aſſurance of the ſoundneſs of their faith and doctrines. Now the proteſtant rule of religious duties for all chriſtians whatſoever, as well church-governours as others, is ſcripture interpreted according to the beſt of their own judgment. Church-governours therefore, when they require the candidates for the office of public teaching to ſubſcribe to a confeſſion, drawn up according to this rule, as a teſt of the ſoundneſs of their faith and doctrines, exerciſe their right in ſuch a manner, as is agreeable to the principles of the reformation. If in ſearching farther into this right, when thus exerciſed, you ſhould have the luck, or the ſagacity, to find *a cardinals hat*, you are welcome to wear it.

VI. Where the civil law of the country has provided a maintenance for the public teachers of religion, or has given them any other advantages; theſe legal emoluments are indeed temporal rewards. But our notions of things muſt be very indiſtinct; if we miſtake them for ſanctions of any confeſſion, which muſt be ſubſcribed, before they can be admitted into their office; when they are only rewards for doing the work of the miniſtry. The right, which

which the governours of the church would have had to require this ſubſcription of them, if no legal benefits had been annexed to their office, cannot poſſibly be deſtroyed by a law, which does nothing more, than annex theſe benefits to it. Whether they are paid for their labour by legal ſalaries, or by voluntary contributions, or take no wages at all for it; the duty of the governours of the church to preſerve and advance true religion, by providing ſuch inſtructors for the people, as are ſound in their faith and doctrines, is the ſame: and conſequently the civil power by giving theſe inſtructors a legal revenue makes no alteration in the right to try their faith and doctrines, before they are received into the miniſtry.

The proper queſtion in this part of my diſcourſe is; Whether the civil power by annexing legal emoluments to the office of public teaching affects the right of church-governours to examine into, and approve, the faith and doctrines of the candidates for this office? You have not ventured to meddle with this queſtion; but by your uſual ſlight of hand have changed it for another; "Whether churches or church-governours "have a right to fix terms of communion by temporal "rewards and puniſhments?"

5 "The legal emoluments, here ſpoken of, are, you "ſay, temporal rewards for doing the work of the mi- "niſtry *in one particular mode* preſcribed by the particu- "lar church or church-governours, where the miniſter "does the work: and if the profeſſor will allow, that "church-governours have no right to fix the terms of "communion by temporal rewards and puniſhments, "he

5 Conf. p. 29, 30. n.

" he will ſave you the trouble of enquiring, how *true* " *religion* is promoted by ſending honeſt and conſcien- " cious men to get their livelihood *in ſome other way.*" If to appropriate the legal benefits, we are here ſpeaking of, to thoſe, who do the work of the miniſtry *in one particular mode*, is to *fix terms of communion* by temporal rewards and puniſhments; you ſhould remember, that this is done by civil legiſlators, not by church-governours: for the benefits, we are ſpeaking of, are ſuch, not as the governours of any particular church, but as the civil law of the country has annexed to the office of public teaching. You may obſerve farther, that, however honeſt and conſciencious the men may be, whom you take under your patronage, they are ſent to get their livelihood in ſome other way than this of legal emoluments; not becauſe they will not comply with the terms of communion in any particular church; but becauſe they will not comply with the terms of being admitted into the office of public teaching in it.

[6] " But whoever does the work of the miniſtry in " any other mode, than in the one, which is preſcribed, " is not intitled to the legal reward. And are not the " rewards in this light plainly the means of fixing the " terms of communion in particular churches, and of " ſecuring the obedience of the members ſo rewarded " to the terms ſo fixed?" The laity are out of the queſtion here: for they are not *the members ſo rewarded.* The point therefore, to be conſidered, is, by what means you would contrive to prevent the terms of communion from being fixed by temporal rewards in reſpect of paſtors and teachers. Would you have them do the work of the miniſtry without receiving any temporal reward at all for their labour? No; this is not your meaning: you want to " let your honeſt and conſcien- " cious miniſters into a way of getting a livelihood." Would you therefore have them paid by voluntary contributions? *Who*, you will ſay, *thanks the doctor for this*

[6] Conf. p. 29, 30. n.

this propoſal? The ſeveral members of *one of Lockes voluntary ſocieties*, like a civil legiſlator, would never pay a man for doing the work of the miniſtry; unleſs he would do it in that one particular mode, which is approved of by themſelves: voluntary contributions therefore, though paid in different ſocieties for doing the work of the miniſtry in different modes, would in each be temporal rewards for doing it in one particular mode. And beſides, if this was all you wanted for your friends, they might eaſily have it in ſuch a country as ours: unleſs their mode of doing the work ſhould happen to be ſuch, as no chriſtians would approve of, beſides themſelves. The civil legiſlator, if he would [7] *tender you ſomething worth acceptance*, muſt provide legal emoluments, to pay them for doing this work in any mode, which they pleaſe.——Suppoſe therefore an honeſt and conſciencious *mahometan*, or ſuppoſe an honeſt and conſciencious *papiſt* ſhould, in a chriſtian and proteſtant country, do it each in his own mode; do you mean *to give up the general benefit propoſed by ſubſcriptions*, in order to *accommodate* ſuch doers of the work as theſe with eſtabliſhed rewards? You may tell me perhaps, on hearing this propoſal; that you call the men, for whom you plead, uſeful and conſciencious *miniſters*; that you ſpeak, as the name might ſhew me, of *chriſtian and proteſtant miniſters*, not of *turkiſh imans* or *popiſh prieſts*; that, if I did not underſtand the name, I might have known, whom you meant *to accommodate*, by your propoſal of changing ſubſcription to an eſtabliſhed confeſſion into "a "ſolemn declaration on the part of paſtors and teach-"ers, that they believe the ſcriptures to be the word "of God, and will inſtruct the people out of them "*only*;" in ſhort, that your meaning is to confine the legal rewards for doing the work of the miniſtry to chriſtians and proteſtants. Well then; if you will inform me, how theſe rewards may be thus confined, without

[7] Conf. p. 29. n.

without making them the means of ſecuring thoſe paſtors and teachers, to whom they are given, in the profeſſion of chriſtianity and proteſtantiſm: it will afterwards be no difficult matter for me to ſhew you in return, how they may be confined to thoſe proteſtant paſtors and teachers, who do the work of the miniſtry *in one particular mode*, without being the means of fixing the terms of communion in a particular church, and of ſecuring the obedience of the members ſo rewarded to the terms ſo fixed. Whatever care may be taken to prevent all perſons from having a ſhare in them, beſides thoſe, who are chriſtians and proteſtants upon principle; the like care may be taken to prevent all proteſtants from having a ſhare in them, beſides thoſe, who will upon principle do the work of the miniſtry in that one particular mode, which the civil legiſlator, who eſtabliſhes the rewards, prefers before all others: unleſs indeed you take it for granted, that, where the civil power has annexed legal benefits to the office of public teaching, the ſincerity of thoſe candidates for the office, who make only a general profeſſion of being chriſtians and proteſtants, may be depended upon, but that they, who make an explicit declaration of their faith and doctrines, muſt needs be inſincere. With ſuch a poſtulatum as this you may prove any thing.

VII. To ſay the truth; the more beneficial the office of public teaching in the church is made, the greater occaſion there will be to guard againſt falſe teachers by requiring ſubſcriptions of thoſe, who are admitted to it. The emoluments, which it brings along with it, will be apt to make many eager to undertake it, who, if it had been merely burdenſome, or had been attended with ſlender and uncertain advantages, would have been con-

tented to enjoy their errors in private, or would have had few opportunities of ſpreading them amongſt the ignorant and unlearned, and no opportunity at all of ſpreading them with the ſame weight, as when they come from a licenſed miniſter of the goſpel.

As you have nothing particular to object to this paragraph, we may go on to the next.

VIII. It is eaſy to ſee, what are the true grounds of a complaint, which we ſometimes hear in our own country; that [f] "many a conſciencious and uſeful miniſter is groaning "under the burden of ſubſcriptions, being re"duced to the unhappy dilemma of *ſubſcribe* or "*ſtarve*." Take away the legal emoluments of the miniſtry; and, though you leave ſubſcriptions, theſe uſeful miniſters, as they are called, will make no complaint of their being under the dilemma of either ſubſcribing to our articles, or of not enjoying the liberty of preaching the goſpel. Nor is the caſe fairly ſtated in the preſent ſituation of things. Subſcription is no new teſt of our opinions, which is then firſt propoſed to us, when we are already in the miniſtry, and are going to be admitted to an eccleſiaſtical benefice: for we cannot be received into the loweſt order of miniſters without it. They therefore, who are concerned in this dilemma, ſhould not be called miniſters. And the dilemma itſelf, in reſpect of the candidates for the miniſtry, as they are long be-

fore aware, that ſubſcription will be required of them, is not *ſubſcribe* or *ſtarve*; but, either you muſt, by ſubſcribing to the eſtabliſhed confeſſion of the church, in which you deſire to be a teacher of the goſpel, give it the evidence, which it requires, that your faith and doctrines are ſuch, as it judges to be agreeable to the true religion of Chriſt; or elſe you muſt apply yourſelf to ſome other way of getting a livelihood.

[f] Confeſſional. p. 31. 15.

[8] " The diſſenting clergy, as is well known, are ex-" cluded," you ſay, " from the *legal* emoluments of the " miniſtry, and are not legally at liberty to preach the " goſpel, but upon condition of ſubſcribing to the ma-" jor part of our articles." As you have thought proper to mention this ſubſcription here, I would remind you, that, according to an obſervation of your own, [9] " the civil powers, and not the church are appointed " to take it." And you may obſerve farther, that it is required by the civil powers in an act of parliament, and not by church-governours in a canon. However therefore it might have come into view, if you had been replying to a vindication of the right of the civil magiſtrate to eſtabliſh religion; it is foreign from the general ſubject of my diſcourſe, which is confined to what church-governours have a right to do within thoſe churches, over which they preſide; and we ſhall ſee preſently, that it is no leſs foreign from the ſubject of this paragraph in particular. With this preface you introduce the caſe of " Mr. *James Pierce*, and Mr. *Joſeph Hallet* " junior, of *Exeter*, who in the year 1719, were" by other diſſenters " *ſhut out of their pulpits*, as Mr. " *Pierce* expreſſes it, for refuſing to ſubſcribe," [1] at

 the

8 Conf. p. 44. n. 9 Conf. p. 147. n. 1 Caſe of the min ſters ejected at *Exon.*

the inſtance of theſe others, "the *firſt* article of the church "of *England*," [2] or the ſixth anſwer in the *aſſemblys* catechiſm, or a vote of their own aſſembly. I have taken the liberty to add a circumſtance or two of this caſe, which you have omitted in relating it: becauſe, as you *happen* to mention only a refuſal to ſubſcribe the firſt article of the church of England, and *to tack it* to the ſubſcription required of diſſenting miniſters by the toleration-act, 1 *Will. & Mar. ſtat.* 1. *c.* 18; you might, undeſignedly no doubt, lead ſuch of your readers, as are not beforehand acquainted with the fact, to imagine that theſe two miniſters were prevented by ſome ſcruples about the firſt article from complying with this act, and were thereupon "excluded from, or by, their "reſpective congregations. This however and ſome "other caſes, which you could produce, are," you ſay, "in point" to prove, that, if the legal emoluments of the miniſtry were taken away, thoſe uſeful miniſters, as they are called, of whom [3] you were ſpeaking in the *confeſſional*, would ſtill complain of being under the dilemma of either ſubſcribing to our articles, or of not enjoying the liberty of preaching the goſpel? I ſhall not enquire; whether, if you ſhould hear any of the diſſenting clergy complain, that the pulpits of the church of England are barred againſt them by ſubſcriptions, you would think, that they had nothing in view, but the liberty of preaching the goſpel in them: or whether Mr. *Pierce* intended, that the grievance of himſelf and his friends ſhould be underſtood to conſiſt in *a mere excluſion from their own pulpits.* But when you ſay in one of the paſſages of the *confeſſional* here referred to, that [4] "in ſome churches a "formal ſubſcription is ſtill required,—where the moſt "ſerious, conſcientious, and uſeful miniſters, are ſtill "groaning under the burden of ſubſcriptions;" I would beg leave to aſk, whether you mean, that the diſſenting

[2] Weſtern inquiſition. p. 147. 148. [3] Conf. p. 43. 44. 16. [4] Conf. p. 16.

ing clergy are groaning under the burden of the ſubſcription required by the toleration-act? No; for you elſewhere congratulate them on their [5]happineſs, that the civil powers, and not the church, "being appointed to take this ſubſcription, are not ſo immediately "*intereſted* in the glory of orthodoxy." Or do you mean, that they are groaning under any "formal ſubſcriptions," which their own congregations require of them? No; for you elſewhere intimate, that [6]"at "preſent they have no impoſers of teſts in their own fraternity." In the other paſſage therefore when you ſay, that [7]"one hundred at leaſt of *our* miniſters ſubſcribe the "articles of religion every year, and miniſter in their "ſeveral congregations by one common form, framed "for the general on the model of the confeſſion ſubſcribed by them;"—amongſt whom you find "many "a conſcientious miniſter under the unhappy dilemma "of *ſubſcribe* or *ſtarve*;" are theſe the diſſenting clergy? No; for, not to inſiſt on your calling them *our* miniſters, the diſſenting clergy do not miniſter in their ſeveral congregations by a common form, framed on the model of any confeſſion, which one hundred of them at leaſt ſubſcribe every year. But if you were not ſpeaking of the diſſenting clergy in theſe paſſages, from whence the ſubject of this paragraph was taken; what has the ſubſcription required of them by the toleration-act to do here? or how can any caſes, in which they and their own people only are concerned, be caſes in point?

Well; no matter, of whom you were ſpeaking: for [8]"if there is ſuch ſelf-denial in diſſenters, ſhall we ſay, "or even ſuppoſe, that legal emoluments have a ſtronger bias upon the *more enlightened* minds of the members of the eſtabliſhment?" Enough, Sir! You need not, I ſee, be very nice in the choice of your caſes: whatever may be wanting in them, will be made amends

5 Conf. p. 147. 148. n. 6 Conf. p. 55. n. 7 Conf. p. 43. 44. 8 Conf. p. 45. n.

amends for by your logic:—becauſe thoſe diſſenters, whoſe ſcruples prevented them from ſubſcribing, were not byaſſed by temporal benefits; therefore thoſe clergy of the eſtabliſhment are not, who ſubſcribe with all their ſcruples about them. To a man who can argue at this rate, no caſes can ever come amiſs.—So much for the "notorious facts, by which "the profeſſors judgment is contradicted." Give him leave to add a word about the "uncharitableneſs" of it. He does not "ſay, that none of the eſtabliſhed "clergy have any ſcruples about ſubſcribing;" but he ſays, that thoſe amongſt them, whoſe ſcruples have no other influence upon their conduct, but to make them groan under ſubſcriptions, with which they comply in order to qualify themſelves for the legal emoluments of the miniſtry, have theſe emoluments more at heart, than the liberty of preaching the goſpel, and are not, though you chide him for not calling them, conſcien-cious miniſters.

After conſenting, that they, "who are concerned in "your dilemma ſhould not be called *miniſters*, but *men*," you ſtate their caſe thus; "Many an uſeful and con-"ſcientious *man* after having ſpent his time and his for-"tune among doctors and profeſſors, in fitting himſelf "for the miniſtry, finds, in the twenty third [year] of "his life, ſuch conditions preſcribed, as he cannot in "conſcience comply with, and that he is reduced to "the unhappy dilemma of ſubſcribing at all adventures "or ſtarving." You may poſſibly find, that ſome other corrections ſhould be made in your ſtating of the caſe, beſides this of changing the word *miniſter* into *man*; when you have enquired; Whether the confeſſion, to which they are to ſubſcribe before they are ordained, is kept ſo cloſely locked up *in the archives af church-go-vernors*, that they can never get a ſight of it, till the twenty third year of their lives? Whether all, who have ever ſubſcribed to it before, are ſworn to ſecreſy? Whether no comments upon it, and no controverſies

about

about it, have ever been publiſhed? Whether ſuch books, as theſe, are under an interdict, ſo that they, who are fitting themſelves for the miniſtry, are not at liberty to read them? And let me above all recommend to your conſideration what the remarker on Dr. Powells ſermon ſays in his dedication *to the younger ſtudents in both our univerſities, who are deſigned for the miniſtry of the church*,——9 "You are *now* timely apprized of "your ſituation, [in reſpect of ſubſcriptions.] You have the opportunity "of a free and convenient intercourſe "with each other. You may receive great light and "aſſiſtance, by frequent and friendly debates and con-"ferences upon this important ſubject, among your-"ſelves; and the ſenſible and conſcientious part of "you, great encouragement to hold faſt your in-"tegrity." Whatever might therefore be the caſe formerly; You,—I am always making this miſtake, the remarker muſt be greatly diſappointed in his expectations of the regard, which would be paid to his pamphlet; if all the younger ſtudents in both our univerſities are not *now* aware, before the twenty third year of their lives, of the ſubſcription, which is required from the candidates for the miniſtry. Thoſe therefore, who "in "the profeſſors opinion are not under the dilemma of "*ſubſcribe* or *ſtarve*, but may apply themſelves to ſome "other way of getting a livelihood, than this of "being teachers of the goſpel," are not ſuch, as never were appriſed of that ſubſcription, till they had ſpent their time and their fortune in fitting themſelves for the miniſtry, but ſuch, as by the help of this remarker, or by other means as good, had received early notice of it. In what way they may get their livelihood, may be learned from the ſame dedication. 1 "Gentlemen"; ſays the remarker to the ſtudents in both our univerſities, "You are under none of the hard neceſſities, which "diſtreſs thoſe, who [in regard to the ſubſcriptions re-"quired

9 Rem. on Dr. Powells Sermon. Dedic. p. xx. 1 Rem. &c. dedic. xix.

" quired in the church of England] diſcover not the " truth of the caſe, till it is too late to turn themſelves " to other employments.

" The world is all before you, where to chuſe
" Your place of reſt and providence your guide.

" It is a lucky circumſtance too, that the ſort of learn- " ing called mathematical, ſhould at this particular " juncture be cheriſhed and cultivated, in *one* of our " univerſities eſpecially;—a ſcience, which ſeems to be " calculated for your ſucceſs in military, naval, mer- " cantile, and mechanical employments." Thus he, whoever he was, when he wanted to perſuade them to reject the eſtabliſhed conditions of being admitted to the office of public teaching, could tempt them by ſhewing them the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. But, Gentlemen, ſay you, beware of the vindicator: for when he tells you, that, if you do not ſubſcribe, though you cannot obtain the legal emoluments of the miniſtry, you will be in no danger of ſtarving, but may get a livelihood in ſome other way; this is only a ſcheme to raiſe [2] " able-bodied men," and, if you liſten to him, he will lead you on to " ſpend your time " and your fortune among doctors and profeſſors, and " then will ſend you out with a ſpade and a pick-ax to " get this ſame *livelihood* by working upon the " turnpike roads."

IX. There have indeed been ſome, who after the ſubſcription, which they made on their entrance into the miniſtry, have ſcrupled to repeat it, and have therefore continued without any eccleſiaſtical preferment, till their ſcruples were removed, or perhaps as long as they lived. But the number has been too ſmall for any one to pretend, that it would be reaſonable for the ſake of ſuch as theſe to give up the general benefit

[2] Conf. p. 46. n.

benefit propoſed by ſubſcriptions. And if they, who are ready to repeat them, as often as preferment offers itſelf, ſhould be repreſented as [2] "groaning under the burden of them;" this repreſentation would ſcarce move the pity of any conſiderate man: for if their conſcience allows of what they do, they want no relief; and if they act againſt their conſcience, they deſerve none.

2 Confeſſional. p. 15.

When from thoſe, who "groan under the burden "of ſubſcriptions," you have deducted thoſe, who *holdin*, after they have renounced them, and thoſe, [3] who groan for more preferment, than they have already, and, if they can obtain it, ſubſcribe, and groan again; "be "the remainder *ever ſo few*, they are," you ſay, "*ſuch as theſe*, that is, uſeful and conſciencious miniſ-"ters, that the confeſſional ſpeaks of." I find therefore, now you come to explain yourſelf, that *many* a conſciencious and uſeful miniſter, in the arithmetic of the *confeſſional*, ſtands for *a few*.

[4] "But if ſubſcription is conſidered as a teſt, where-"by the ſoundneſs of the candidate in faith and doc-"trine is aſcertained; and if this be the general benefit "propoſed by it; where," ſay you, "would be the "unreaſonableneſs of giving up for the ſake of uſeful "and conſciencious men, though ever ſo few, what "can never be obtained from any ſubſcriber, who takes "the advantage of the latitude allowed by ſome de-"fenders of ſubſcription; eſpecially as they, who do "not take this advantage, are *perhaps* ſtill fewer in "number than they, who ſcruple to ſubſcribe at all." I ſhall leave you to conſider at your leiſure, whether theſe conſciencious men, however uſeful miniſters they might be in ſome reſpects, could be looked upon as uſe-

 ful

3 Conf. p. 44. 46. 47. n. compare p. 16. 4 Conf. p. 46. 47. n.

ful miniſters upon the whole in a church, to which their faith and doctrines appear after mature deliberation to be in ſome particulars contrary to the ſcriptures. In the mean time I commend your prudence for adding the word *perhaps*, when you are talking about a matter, of which you can know little or nothing. The number of thoſe miniſters, who after the ſubſcription, which they made on their entrance into the miniſtry, take no preferment, or who reſign it afterwards, is matter of notoriety: and the number of conſciencious non-ſubſcribing miniſters in our own church, of which, as you may remember, we are now ſpeaking, falls ſhort of this; for ſome, who have refuſed, and ſome, who have reſigned, preferment, have had no ſcruples about ſubſcription. But, unleſs you have *the gift of diſcerning the hearts and conſciences of particular perſons*, how will you determine on the other hand, what latitude ſubſcribers allow themſelves, and whether there are many or few, who do not allow themſelves ſuch a latitude, as will prevent their ſubſcription from being any teſt of their faith and doctrines? Your reaſoning is as curious, as your calculation;——Thoſe benefits *cannot* be obtained by a law, which *are not* obtained by it: and a law, which does not obtain the benefits propoſed by it in their full extent, ſhould be repealed; and theſe benefits, as far as they may be, and in fact are, obtained, ſhould be given up.

X. But to return to the point in queſtion. The writer, who led me to employ your thoughts on the ſubject of ſubſcriptions, allows, that [h] "where the methods of promoting "chriſtianity are matter of ſcripture-precept, "or are plainly recommended by ſcripture-"precedents, they ſhould be ſtrictly followed." Now St. Paul in his epiſtle to Titus, [i] when he had

had left him in Crete to ordain elders there, directs, that they ſhould be ſuch, as held faſt the faithful word agreeably to what they had been taught: and in another of his epiſtles [k] he gives the like charge to Timothy about the ordaining of deacons; they were to be ſuch, as held the myſtery of the faith in a pure conſcience. There is no occaſion to enquire, whether Timothy and Titus, in trying the faith and doctrines of the ſeveral candidates, required them to ſubſcribe their names to a formal confeſſion. However this might be; the precept of the apoſtle is as much in point, as can be deſired. For to a man, who has no deſign to deceive or to prevaricate, when he finds, that, if he had applyed for holy orders to Timothy or Titus, they could not have ordained him conſiſtently with the commands of St. Paul, unleſs he had firſt made an explicit declaration of his faith and doctrines, and they had judged them to be agreeable to the goſpel of Chriſt, it can be of no importance, whether he ſhould have been at liberty to make this declaration in words of his own, or have been obliged to uſe a form dictated by them; whether he might have been allowed to ſpeak it only, or muſt have left it upon record by making it in writing. His words and expreſſions, if he had choſen them himſelf, muſt have been ſuch, as would have left them no more room to doubt of his meaning, than if they had preſcribed them to him; and his declaration, if he made it by ſpeaking, would have been as binding upon

his conſcience, as if he had given it under his hand.

[h] Confeſſional. p. 29. [i] Tit. i. 5. 9. [k] 1 Tim. iii. 9.

The ſcripture-precepts here alledged are ſo clear an evidence, that it was the duty of Timothy and Titus to admit no perſon to the office of public teaching, unleſs he had firſt made a declaration of his faith; that you have nothing to ſay to the contrary. Whether they had a right to require an explicit declaration, or only a general one, is the ſubject of enquiry in a long note on the next paragraph.

XI. But might not theſe primitive church-governours [l] "be contented with a ſolemn de-" claration on the part of teachers and paſtors, " that they received the ſcriptures as the word " of God, and would inſtruct the people out " of them?" As I can ſee no diſtinction, worth an honeſt mans regarding, between a ſubſcription and a ſolemn declaration, ſo one or two inſtances of what happened very early in the church will ſerve to ſhew us, whether a general profeſſion of believing whatever is contained in the ſcripture, or of adhering to the doctrine of the apoſtles, was likely to ſatisfy Timothy or Titus, that they, who made it, " held faſt the " faithful word, as they had been taught, the " myſtery of faith in a pure conſcience." We learn from St. Peter, that there were in his time [m] unlearned and unſtable men who wreſted the epiſtles of St. Paul, and the other ſcriptures likewiſe to their own deſtruction; and from St. Paul, that there were ſome, who, [n] "taking " occaſion

" occaſion from the doctrine of *free grace*, " ſlandered the apoſtles as having taught, that " men might do evil, that good might come." After the epiſtle to the Romans had been publiſhed throughout the whole church, as it poſſibly might have been, when thoſe to Timothy and Titus were written, the apoſtolical doctrine on this head was ſo plainly declared, as not to admit of ſuch a miſrepreſentation. But the inſtance nevertheleſs comes up to my purpoſe; as it ſhews, that the meaning of thoſe words and expreſſions, which were made uſe of by the apoſtles to declare their doctrines to the world, are liable to be miſrepreſented.

[l] Confeſſional. p. 16. [m] 2 Pet. iii. 16. [n] Confeſſional, p. 80. Rom. iii. 8.

To require an explicit declaration of faith and doctrines is, according to your repreſentation of the matter, [5] " to amplify and ſplit the apoſtolic confeſſion, ex- " preſſed in general terms, into particular propoſitions, " and to require a declaration of aſſent to this amplifi- " cation." You muſt excuſe me, if I cannot give you credit for the exiſtence of an apoſtolic confeſſion expreſſed in general terms. When you have produced it, I will allow you to argue from it. St. Paul commands, that they who are ordained elders, ſhould be ſuch, as hold faſt the faithful word, as they have been taught; and that they, who are ordained deacons, ſhould be ſuch, as hold the myſtery of the faith in a pure conſcience: I am unwilling to ſuſpect, that you, who are ſo deſirous to [6] " bring me acquainted with the diſtinc- " tion between a *canon* and an *article*," ſhould know ſo little of this diſtinction yourſelf, as to miſtake a *canon* for a *confeſſion*, and imagine a general precept directing church-

5 Conf. p. 18. n. 6 Conf. p. 103. n.

church-governours to require from the candidates a declaration of their faith, to be the very words, in which they are to make this declaration; or that you, [7] "who "are for adhering to, and ſtrictly following, ſcripture-"precedents, however you may be ſneered for it," ſhould ſuppoſe yourſelf to have found in the ſcriptures two precedents of an apoſtolic confeſſion of faith expreſſed in general terms, which paſtors and teachers are to make, before they are admitted to their office, and yet ſhould reject them both, and introduce another of your own, as you do, where you tell us, that [8] "the "ſociety, with which a public paſtor is connected, may "reaſonably expect him to declare, that he believes the "ſcriptures, and will make them the rule of his "teaching."

But, as your ſelf-conſiſtency is not always to be depended upon, I ſhall examine a little farther into this matter. [9] At the head of your note you quote the two apoſtolic precepts as they ſtood in my diſcourſe; but in the body of it, though you mention both Timothy and Titus, you drop the precept which was given to the latter of them; and having aſked, "What is "the point, concerning which Timothy and Titus "would want to be ſatisfyed?" you anſwer; "it is, ac-"cording to the profeſſor," you ſhould have ſaid, according to St. Paul, "that the miniſters, they ap-"pointed, held the myſtery of faith in a pure con-"ſcience:" you ſhould have added, or that they held the faithful word, as they had been taught. Why you paſs over this latter precept, I know not: it certainly deſerved your notice, as upon other accounts, ſo particularly becauſe the apoſtle has ſubjoined the reaſon for giving it, which is, [1] that they might be able by ſound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainſayers. Suppoſe, that in the preſent times nothing was required of public paſtors, before they are admitted

[7] Conf. p. 39. 33. n. [8] Conf. p. 388. [9] Conf. p. 17. n.
[1] Tit. i. 9.

ted to their office, but to declare, that they hold faſt the faithful word, as they have been taught; might not they, who have been taught in the church of Rome, anſwer, that they do? There was indeed no *Loyola* or *Dominic* in the times of the apoſtles. But was there no [2] *Hymenæus* or *Philetus*, who concerning the truth had erred, ſaying, that the reſurrection was paſt already, and had overthrown the faith of ſome? [3] Was there no *Diotrephes*, who was ſo far blinded, though not [4] by "*legal emoluments* in poſſeſſion, or "greater in expectation," yet by the love of pre-eminence, the ambition of being at the head of a faction, as to pretend, that he underſtood the goſpel of Chriſt better than the apoſtles, and to prate againſt their commands with malicious words? Were there no [5] unruly and vain talkers, who ſubverted whole houſes, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucres ſake? The end and purpoſe of the precept now before us was, that they, who were appointed to the office of public teaching, might be able by ſound doctrine both to exhort and to convince gainſayers. But if Titus had only aſked the candidates, whether they held the faithful word, as they had been taught, without explaining, what he meant by this faithful word, and examining, whether they meant the ſame; if he had no right to enquire into their doctrines, and to judge of the ſoundneſs of them; they, whom he ordained, might have been ſincere in the anſwers, which they gave to his queſtions, and yet might have been the diſciples of thoſe very gainſayers, who were to be exhorted and convinced.

Proceed we now to the other precept. If Timothy, who was commanded by St. Paul to take care, that they, whom he ordained deacons, ſhould be ſuch, as held the myſtery of faith in a pure conſcience, had no right to require more from the candidates than to make a gene-

2 2 Tim. ii. 17. 18. 3 3 John. 9. 10. 4 Conf. p. 200. n. 5 Tit. i. 10.

a general declaration of their faith in the very words of the precept; the myſtery of the faith, which they profeſſed to hold, might have been [6] a myſtery of iniquity, which, though the man of ſin was not then revealed, had in thoſe early times of the goſpel begun to work. Nor could the requiſition of ſuch a general profeſſion from them be called a tryal or examination: and yet the apoſtle immediately adds; [7] Let theſe alſo firſt be proved; (δοκιμαζέσθωσαν, that is, examined, tryed, enquired into; Δοκιμάσας· κρίνας, ἐξετάσας, ſays Heſychius;) and then let them uſe the office of a deacon, being found blameleſs, ἀνέγκλητοι. Blameleſs in what? ſurely in all the particulars, of which he had juſt been ſpeaking: and amongſt theſe we find the holding of the myſtery of the faith in a pure conſcience. That ἀνέγκλητος, when referred to thoſe, who are candidates for the miniſtry, includes the blameleſſneſs of their faith, is farther evident from what [8] the ſame apoſtle writes to Titus, when having required, that they ſhould be blameleſs, ἀνέγκλητοι, he goes on to ſhew in what particulars, and amongſt the reſt mentions the holding faſt of the faithful word, as they had been taught.

[9] But "the profeſſor," you ſay, "does nothing for "his cauſe; unleſs he can prove, that Timothy and "Titus were *actually diſſatisfyed* with a general profeſ- "ſion." Is this then the caſe of all apoſtolic precepts, that they, who live in after-times, can make no uſe of them for the regulation of their conduct, unleſs they can prove, that thoſe, to whom they were originally given, underſtood them rightly, and actually obeyed them? If it is not; and, though one does not know, what diſtreſs may drive you to, I preſume, you will not ſay, it is; then in order to make good your aſſertion, you muſt ſhew, that the two apoſtolic precepts given to Timothy and Titus to direct their conduct in the

6 2 Theſſ. ii. 3—7. 7 1 Tim. iii. 10. 8 Tit. i. 7, 8, 9. 9 Conf. p. 17. n.

the ſtation of church-governours, have ſomething ſingular in them, which diſtinguiſhes them from all others. The two inſtances here alledged, if you had been willing to underſtand the application of them, might have taught you, that in the earlieſt times of chriſtianity unſcriptural doctrines were extracted from ſcripture-expreſſions, and what had been preached by the apoſtles was applied to ſupport ſuch doctrines, as they never meant to teach. In the firſt of them St. Peter is my witneſs, that in his time the epiſtles of St. Paul, and the other ſcriptures were wreſted. But, whether it is, that nothing could in your opinion happen early in the church, unleſs it happened before the epiſtle to the Romans was written, or that you pay no more regard to St. Peter, than is due to his pretended ſucceſſor; you [1] "deſire to know, whether the epiſtle "to the Romans could be wreſted, before it was writ-"ten." From your referring me to "Dr. *Lardners* "ſupplement, vol. ii. for the reſpective dates of the "epiſtle to the Romans, and the firſt epiſtle to Timo-"thy," one would almoſt think you were afraid, that the ſecond inſtance, as it ſtands at preſent, may not quite come up to my purpoſe. I made no doubt, when I was writing my diſcourſe, but that, if I followed Dr. *Lardner*, and [2] ſuppoſed the firſt epiſtle to Timothy and the epiſtle to Titus to be of an earlier date than that to the Romans, either you, or ſome of your friends for you, would tell me, [3] "that I had "taken the liberty to make my own caſe," and that according to [4] *Pearſon* and [5] *Mill* the epiſtle to the Romans was written the firſt of the three. I therefore put the caſe as unfavourably, as could be, for myſelf, and ſuppoſed that *Pearſons* or *Mills* dates might poſſibly be true. But you are kind enough to put it for me juſt as I would have wiſhed: for according to Dr. *Lardners*

1 Conf. p. 19. n. 2 Lardners ſupplem. v. ii. p. 183. 192. 194. 3 Conf. p. 52. n. 4 Pearſon. annal. Paul. p. 15. 22. 5 Mill. proleg. n. 26. 122, 123.

dates Timothy and Titus were commanded by St. Paul to take care, that thoſe, whom they appointed miniſters, ſhould be ſuch, as " held faſt the faithful word " agreeably to what they had been taught, the myſtery " of the faith in a pure conſcience," about two years before the epiſtle to the Romans was written, in which the doctrine *of doing evil, that good may come*, is explicitly condemned. In the mean time, as there were ſome, who miſrepreſented " what the apoſtles had " taught about *free grace*," and aſcribed this doctrine to them; if Timothy and Titus had required from the candidates nothing more than a general declaration of believing the ſcriptures, or of adhering to the doctrine of the apoſtles, they might have received ſuch men into the miniſtry, as held a doctrine, which the apoſtles deteſted.

Many more inſtances to the ſame purpoſe might have been produced; [6] as I have juſt now ſhewn you. But theſe two ſeemed to me ſufficient to make it likely, that a general profeſſion of believing whatever is contained in the ſcriptures, or of adhering to the doctrine of the apoſtles, would not ſatisfy Timothy or Titus, that they, who made it, held faſt the faithful word, as they had been taught, the myſtery of the faith in a pure conſcience; becauſe I thought it likely, that Timothy and Titus underſtood the precepts, which they had received from St. Paul, and were ready to obey them. If " your likelihoods on the other ſide," when you favour us with a ſight of them, ſhould be as " well-grounded," as you pretend; the profeſſors cauſe will ſtand, juſt as it did: for the precepts are before us; and, whether Timothy and Titus underſtood, and obeyed them, or not, they will ſpeak for themſelves.

What has been ſaid might ſuffice as a full anſwer to the note now in hand; as far as it concerns me. The reſt will be found upon examination to be nothing to the

[6] See above at p. 63.

the purpoſe. In executing St. Pauls commands, there were two points to be enquired into: though you, to prepare the way for the tricks, which are to follow, ſet out with aſking, as if there had been only one, [7] "What is *the point*, concerning which Timothy and "Titus would want to be ſatisfied?" Of the two points, one was, whether the faith, which the candidates profeſſed to hold, was the myſtery of the faith, as it was taught by the apoſtles; the other, whether they were ſincere in their profeſſion. [8] A ſolemn declaration of believing the ſcriptures in general, or, before "the ſcriptures were extant, and collected toge-"ther, as they are now," of adhering to the doctrine of the apoſtles, would in your opinion be as good an evidence of their *ſincerity*, as an explicit one, in which their faith and doctrines were particularly ſet forth. Thus far then we are agreed: the only queſtion between us, as any one may ſee, who reads my diſcourſe with common attention, is upon the other point. In the earlieſt times of chriſtianity there were ſome, as we learn from St. Peter, who wreſted the ſcriptures, and there were others, as we learn from St. Paul, who miſrepreſented the doctrine of the apoſtles: the candidate therefore, if he had received his inſtructions from ſuch men as theſe, might be very ſincere in making a general profeſſion of believing the ſcriptures, or of adhering to the doctrine of the apoſtles, and yet at the ſame time his faith and doctrines might be very unſound.

This being the true ſtate of the caſe; when you aſk, [9] "What could ſatisfy Timothy and Titus, that "the miniſters they appointed, held the myſtery of the "faith in a pure conſcience, leſs than a *perfect* inſight "into the hearts and conſciences of thoſe, who made "the profeſſion?" If you mean, what leſs could ſatisfy them, whether the faith, which the candidate profeſſed to hold, was the ſame, which the apoſtles taught?

7 Conf. p. 17. n. 8 Conf. p. 18. 19. n. 9 Conf. ibid.

my anſwer is; An explicit declaration of it. But if you mean, what leſs could ſatisfy them of his ſincerity? you are as much concerned, as I am, to find an anſwer: for as on the one hand, in making an explicit profeſſion of his faith and doctrines, he might diſſemble and prevaricate; ſo you cannot ſay on the other hand, that "a general declaration, of believing either the "ſcriptures," or the doctrine of the apoſtles, "to be the "word of God," is like Ithuriels ſpear; if it is applied to an unbeliever,

——————"Up he ſtarts
"Diſcovered and ſurprized."——————

Well; but you require, that the general declaration, which you recommend, ſhould be a *ſolemn* one. Be it ſo then; and I agree, that the explicit declaration ſhould be as ſolemn, as you pleaſe. If you allow, that the candidate, by making a *ſolemn* declaration of believing the ſcriptures to be the word of God, would have given Timothy and Titus ſuch a ſatisfactory evidence of his ſincerity, as would have been a reaſonable ground for them to act upon; though they had not "a *perfect* "inſight into his ſincerity, a *perfect* aſſurance of it, a "*perfect* diſcernment of his heart and conſcience;" I allow, that an explicit declaration, made with the like ſolemnity, would probably have ſatisfyed them, that he was ſincere, without this *perfect* inſight, aſſurance, and diſcernment.

1 "Now allowing, ſay you, Timothy and Titus to "have had the gift of *diſcerning* the *hearts* and *con-*"*ſciences* of particular perſons *for this purpoſe*; how "would the profeſſor prove, that church-governours "of the preſent times are endowed with the ſame gift?" *For what purpoſe?* If you mean for the purpoſe of ſatisfying themſelves, that the candidate was ſincere, this is not the queſtion before us: and my argument upon that, which is, inſtead of making it neceſſary for me to prove, that this gift is beſtowed upon church-governours

1 Conf. p. 17. n.

vernours of the preſent times, ſuppoſes it not to have been beſtowed on Timothy or Titus: for if they could have diſcerned the hearts of thoſe, who applied to them for holy orders, they would have had no occaſion to require them to make an explicit declaration of their faith, in order to ſatisfy themſelves, what it was.

But, ſay you, [2] "the vindicator tells us, [3] p. 11. that "the governours of the church have a right to ex- "amine into and aſcertain the faith and doctrines of "the candidates: whereas to aſcertain the faith and "doctrines of any man is impoſſible, unleſs you can "at the ſame [time] aſcertain his ſincerity in profeſſing "them." If you will look once more into the paſſage, to which you refer; you may find, that you have changed the queſtion: the vindicator is there ſpeaking about examining and aſcertaining, what the faith and doctrines are, which the candidates profeſs, not how ſincere they are in profeſſing them.

[4] "Can any one then think it likely, that Timothy "and Titus ſhould take the profeſſors method of re- "quiring an explicit declaration of faith and doctrines "in order to obtain *this* ſatisfaction" [of the ſincerity of the candidates?] "unleſs it is likely, that they had "not the common ſenſe to know, that he, who *was* "*inſincere* in profeſſing his faith in the general doc- "trine of the apoſtles, might be *equally inſincere* in "profeſſing his faith, when amplifyed in a variety of "dogmatical propoſitions." Common ſenſe, let me tell you, will lead a man a great way, if he is willing to follow it: poſſibly, when you reconſider this matter, it may lead you far enough to ſee, that you have ſhifted the queſtion. The proper ſubject of our enquiry was not, whether an explicit declaration of faith and doctrines is a more likely way of ſecuring the ſincerity of the candidate, than a general one: the ſpecial deſign of my method, as you call it, the method of requiring an explicit declaration, is to ſatisfy the governours

2 Conf. p. 18. n. 3 See below in parag. xiv. at the end.
4 Conf. p. 19. n.

nours of the church, whether the faith and doctrines, which the candidate profeſſes to hold, are the ſame, which, according to the beſt of their judgment, the apoſtles have taught; and not whether he is ſincere in his profeſſion. Either ſort of declaration might equally anſwer the latter purpoſe: but either ſort would not equally anſwer the former.

XII. I made choice of this latter inſtance the rather; becauſe the writer, to whom I juſt now referred, propoſing the example of the apoſtles to the imitation of proteſtant churches, aſks, [o] "What courſe they took in this exi- "gency? whether they framed a new creed or "confeſſion, or inſerted into an old one a new "article importing, that no man ſhould do "evil, for the ſake of procuring the greateſt "imaginable good?" and then anſwers, "No, "they left the calumny to be confronted by "the goſpel-hiſtory, and the tenor of their "own writings and converſation, and gave "themſelves no farther trouble about it." We find however, that St. Paul was led by it to write thus to the Romans; "If the truth of "God hath more abounded through my lie "unto his glory; why yet am I alſo judged as "a ſinner; and not rather, as we be ſlander- "ouſly reported, and as ſome affirm, that we "ſay, let us do evil, that good may come? "whoſe damnation is juſt." Care therefore was taken by the apoſtles explicitly to condemn this doctrine, and to inſert an article in oppoſition to it, if not into any creed or confeſſion diſtinct from the ſcriptures, yet into the ſcriptures themſelves.

Upon

[o] Confeſſional, ibid. compare Rom. iii, 7, 8.

Upon this laſt ſentence, which you call my [5] *comment*, you join iſſue, and begin your argument thus ;—— " 1. *Care was taken by the apoſtles* ; by which we are to " underſtand that the epiſtle to the Romans was com- " poſed in a full aſſembly of *the apoſtles*, and that Paul " was no more than the ſcribe of the ſynod." The care, it ſeems, in your idea, was taken, not by *the apoſtles*, but by *one apoſtle :* and ſo I ſhould have been nonſuited ; if [6] Chillingworth had not taught me to plead, that " what was written by one, was ap- " proved by all." This objection however, may have its uſe : for though it does not affect my cauſe, it lets me into your meaning, where you " do very ſeriouſly " aſſure me, that it was what *the apoſtle* Paul was led " by the calumny mentioned above to write in this " very paſſage of the epiſtle to the Romans, that led " you to write as you did in the *confeſſional*." When I was reading the *confeſſional*, what you now avow appeared wonderful to me, that St. Paul *by expreſsly condemning* thoſe, who affirmed, that to do evil in order to obtain good was a doctrine taught by the apoſtles, ſhould lead any one to ſay, that " *the apoſtles* when this report was " ſpread, *left it* to be confronted by the goſpel-hiſtory " and the tenor of their own writings and converſation, " and *gave themſelves no farther trouble* about it." I thought once, that you might perhaps " quibble away" what you had ſaid, and that amongſt *the writings* of the apoſtles, by the tenor of which you ſuppoſed them to leave this report to be confronted, you might reckon this epiſtle, in which they did give themſelves the trou- ble of making an explicit declaration on the ſubject. But I find myſelf miſtaken. You have no occaſion to have recourſe to this ſubterfuge : the whole matter, now you have lent me the true key, is plain and open. The authors of this report were *expreſsly condemned* only by *the apoſtle* Paul : we cannot therefore ſay, that *the apoſtles* gave themſelves any farther trouble about it, " unleſs " we

5 Conf. p. 103. n. 6 Chilling. i. 7. See above at p. 27.

" we ſuppoſe, that the epiſtle to the Romans was com-
" poſed in a full aſſembly of them, and that Paul was
" the ſcribe to this *article-making convocation.*"

But to proceed with your argument. " 2. *The* " *apoſtles took care explicitly to condemn the doctrine.* " Not," ſay you, " in this paſſage. St. Paul barely " relates, that the doctrine was ſlanderouſly reported " of them. He denounces indeed condemnation a-" gainſt the ſlanderers."——What, I'll warrant you, without condemning the doctrine! though the damnation of thoſe, who aſcribed it to the apoſtles, was juſt; the doctrine itſelf was innocent! " The apoſtle " however by denouncing condemnation upon the ſlan-" derers gives the paſſage *the air* of a *canon* rather than " of an *article.*" Whether my calling it an *article*, which you ſuppoſe a miſnomer, will affect my comment, is ſubmitted to the judgment of any one, who is well enough acquainted with the xxxix articles of the church of England, to remember *the air* of the 16th and 18th.

The concluſion of your argument is, " 3. *And to* " *inſert an article in oppoſition to it*; you would be glad " to know where?" If your eyes are not good enough to ſee it in the record, which is before you; Chillingworths were: he ſays, [7] " St. Paul plainly tells us, " that *we may not do the leaſt evil, that we may do the* " *greateſt good.*

XIII. When thoſe, who allow, that [p] " ſuch " methods of promoting chriſtianity, as are " plainly recommended by ſcripture-prece-" dents, ought to be ſtrictly followed," complain of it as " an unwarrantable encroach-" ment on chriſtian liberty," that ſubſcriptions ſhould be required to be made to religious propoſitions

7 Chillingworth, v. 85.

poſitions expreſſed in any other than ſcripture-language; one is apt to ſuſpect, that by a ſcripture-precedent they mean a precedent of a confeſſion recorded in the ſcriptures, and expreſſed there in unſcriptural words. But without looking for ſuch inconſiſtencies, it is enough for us to find, that St. Paul, when he commanded Timothy and Titus to examine into the faith of all thoſe, whom they ſhould receive into the miniſtry, gave them no directions to uſe only ſcripture-language: for we may reaſonably conclude from hence, that they were left at liberty to propoſe their queſtions in any words, which would aſcertain their meaning.

p Confeſſional, p. 29, 19.

[8] "The thing complained of, at [9] page 19 of the "former edition of the confeſſional, as an unwarrant-"able encroachment on chriſtian liberty, is," you ſay, "the practice of requiring ſubſcription to human ex-"plications of chriſtian doctrines. But are ſcripture-"precedents called for here to juſtify the practice?" I anſwer; No: and for this reaſon I compared the 29th page with the 19th. What you call for here is, what "Eraſmus Johannes, the venturous ſchoolmaſter of "Antwerp," whoſe propoſals had been mentioned [1] at the 18th page, and what likewiſe "an eminent prelate "of our own church," called for, the "*language of "ſcripture, old and ſcriptural words and phraſes to ex-"preſs religious propoſitions and articles of faith:*" and you conclude this call with a complaint, that "the re-"quiring ſubſcription to human explications of ſcrip-"ture-doctrines is an unwarrantable encroachment on "chriſtian liberty." The profeſſor therefore has ob-

K ſerved

8 Conf. p. 40. n. 9 Conf. p. 22—25. 1 Conf. p. 21.

ſerved all GOOD FAITH in repreſenting the ſubſtance of what he had read in your 19th page. " But ſcrip-
" ture-precedents *in general happen*," you ſay, " to be
" recommended at the diſtance of *ten pages*, as the
" ſafeſt for church-governours to follow in all caſes."
And do not you *happen in general* to deliver it as [2] " your
" opinion, that *ſcripture-precedents ſhould be ſtrictly fol-*
" *lowed* and adhered to?" And do not you afterwards, [3] at the 30th and 31ſt pages, *happen* to explain yourſelf as to this *general* recommendation in all caſes, by applying it to the *particular* caſe of *requiring ſubſcription* to the xxxix articles of the church of England, which you call " an *unſcriptural* article of church-diſcipline?" Your comfort however is, that the profeſſor muſt have " a very new way of looking for inconſiſtencies, if he " tacks two things together, which are ſo far aſunder," and expects to find you conſiſtent with yourſelf at the diſtance of *ten pages*. You may add, if you think it will be any ſaving of your credit, that, in order to convict you of calling for ſcripture-precedents in the *particular* caſe deſcribed at the 19th page, the caſe of requiring ſubſcriptions to religious propoſitions expreſſed in new and unſcriptural words and phraſes, when you endeavoured to evade the charge, by telling your readers, that at the 29th page you *happen* to recommend ſcripture-precedents *in general*, " a profeſſed diſputant" was forced to " claim the privilege" of looking two pages farther.

[4] " The profeſſor however does his beſt endeavour," you ſay, " to gratify your moſt inconſiſtent demands,
" and give you a ſcripture-precedent for requiring ſub-
" ſcription or declaration of aſſent to a confeſſion ex-
" preſſed in unſcriptural language." Your proof is, that he declares, " he will *not* look for ſuch inconſi-
" ſtencies, but *is ſatisfyed with having found*, what he
" did look for, two *ſcripture-precepts*, in which St. Paul
" commands Timothy and Titus to examine into the
" faith

[2] Conf. p. 39. [3] Conf. p. 42. 43. [4] Conf. p. 40. n.

" faith of the candidates for the office of public teach-
" ing, without giving them any directions to uſe only
" ſcripture-language." But if you are a little unlucky in your proofs, the profeſſor, it ſeems, is not more fortunate: for [5] " unleſs, when the epiſtles to Timothy and Titus
" were written, the other ſcriptures of the new teſta-
" ment were extant and collected together, as we have
" them now; theſe *no directions* of St. Paul *might be*
" owing to the want of a complete rule to direct the
" examination of the candidates." A *might be* is not worth attending to in any caſe: and your inſinuation about a complete rule to be found in the ſcriptures can miſlead only a few ſuperficial readers, who do not know the difference between a rule to direct the faith of the candidate, and a rule to direct church-governours, how to try and examine, whether the faith, which he has extracted from thence, is the ſame, which is delivered there. The ſcriptures, now they are all extant and collected together, contain a complete rule of faith: but whether you look into the epiſtles to Timothy and Titus only, or ſearch the new teſtament from one end to the other, you will find no directions given to church-governours to confine themſelves to ſcripture-language in examining into the faith of the candidates for the office of public teaching. Thus the ſlender twig of a *might be* growing out of a *quibble*, which, if you could have held it, would not have ſaved you from ſinking, ſlips out of your hands.

When I ſay, that Timothy and Titus were left at liberty to propoſe their queſtions in any words, which would beſt *aſcertain their meaning*; it is pity, that the whole train of my argument ſhould ſhew every capable reader, that *to aſcertain their meaning* is to aſcertain what they, according to the beſt of their judgment, underſtood to be the true faith delivered by the apoſtles. This untoward circumſtance has ſpoiled [6] a witticiſm at the cloſe of your note, which conſiſts in quoting on-

[5] Conf. p. 40. n. [6] Conf. p. 41. n.

ly half a ſentence of mine, and has made the long preamble, which introduces it, end as it begins —— in nothing.

XIV. Do we therefore ſay, that [q] " new and " unſcriptural words will better fix the ſenſe of " ſcripture-doctrine, than the words of Chriſt " and his apoſtles?" To take off the invidiouſneſs of this queſtion, I will beg leave, before I anſwer it, to aſk another. Do not they, who object this to us, hold, that [r] paſtors and teachers by familiar, clear, and uſual forms of ſpeech can make the ſenſe of ſcripture more plain to their hearers, than if they were to read it to them in the words, which Chriſt and his apoſtles made uſe of? They muſt, if they think otherwiſe, maintain, that all preaching and interpreting of the ſcriptures is entirely uſeleſs, and that the public teachers in proteſtant churches have nothing elſe to do for the inſtruction of their congregations, but to read the bible to them. I do not mean from the utility of preaching or interpreting the ſcriptures in chriſtian aſſemblies [s] to infer the utility of eſtabliſhed confeſſions, but to remind the oppoſers of ſuch confeſſions, that what they hold in one caſe is exactly ſimilar to what they imagine would bring an odium upon us, if we were to ſay it in the other. For if the ſenſe of ſcripture may be expreſſed more plainly, why not more preciſely, than in the words of Chriſt and his apoſtles? To paſs over the ordinary mutability of language; every ſect, which has ſprung up ſince the firſt planting of chriſtianity,

ty, has had an interpretation of ſcripture peculiar to itſelf; and much pains have all along been taken by the ſeveral leaders of theſe numberleſs contending parties to give ſuch a ſenſe to the words of Chriſt and his apoſtles, as might appear moſt ſuitable to their own favourite opinions. Thus by [t]the perverſe diſputings of men of corrupt minds a variety of meanings has been found out for thoſe ſcripture-expreſſions, which were originally intended to convey but one; and nothing is more common, than to extract very unſcriptural doctrines from ſcripture-language. The governours of the church have therefore found it neceſſary to introduce what are called new and unſcriptural words and expreſſions, not to fix the ſenſe of ſcripture-doctrines, but to fix the ſenſe, in which ſcripture-expreſſions are underſtood by thoſe, who are candidates for the office of public teaching, and whoſe faith and doctrines they have therefore a right to examine into and aſcertain.

[q] Confeſſional. p. 19. [r] Confeſſional. p. 41. [s] Confeſſional. p. 41. [t] 1 Tim. vi. 5.

Here you fall downright into a fit of ſcolding. [7] "Truly, Mr. profeſſor, neither *thus* nor *ſo!*" What is it, with which you ſuffer yourſelf to be thus provoked? Why, "the profeſſor has referred only to the 41ſt "page of the former edition; whereas he ought to "have read not only this, but the 39th and the 40th "beſides." A mighty matter indeed; to drive the great corrector of church-diſcipline to expoſe himſelf in this manner! The profeſſor however did read all [8]the three pages; and found, at the 39th, that the *remonſtrants* argue

[7] Conf. p. 23. n. [8] Conf. p. 59. 60. 61.

argue in favour of confeſſions from the utility of interpretations of ſcripture propoſed by paſtors and teachers in chriſtian aſſemblies; at the 40th, that you do not underſtand their meaning; and at the 41ſt, that, be their meaning what it will, "from the utility of interpreting "ſcripture in occaſional propheſyings nothing can, in "your opinion, be inferred in favour of ſtated confeſ-"ſions." He endeavoured therefore, as well as he could, to ſuit himſelf to your capacity and your opinion: he thought it "no very eaſy matter to make "you underſtand the drift of the argument made uſe "of by the remonſtrants;" and declared, that he did not mean from the utility of preaching to infer the utility of eſtabliſhed confeſſions. This declaration pacifies you a little; as it ſhews, that "the particulars "in your 41ſt page," to which he refers, "had not "been without their effect upon him."

But the calm does not laſt long: for before you have got through the ſentence, which had thus flattered your vanity, you break out again, and quarrel with him in your note, becauſe he declines an inference, for which you had quarrelled with the remonſtrants in your text.—"Why "not infer the utility of eſtabliſhed confeſſions from the "utility of preaching in chriſtian aſſemblies, if his alter-"native is rightly ſtated." The grievance however is, not merely that the profeſſor declines making this inference, but that he likewiſe reminds the oppoſers of confeſſions, that what they hold in common with other chriſtians in the caſe of preaching and interpreting the ſcriptures in their congregations is exactly ſimilar to what they imagine would bring an odium upon us, if we were to ſay it in the caſe of confeſſions. [9] "When a certain emi-"nent prelate," as you relate the matter, "had reduced "his antagoniſts to the diſagreeable neceſſity of holding, "that new and unſcriptural words would better fix the "ſenſe of ſcripture-doctrines, than the words of Chriſt "and his apoſtles, the clamour [againſt him] ſubſided."

Now

9 Conf. p. 22.

Now this appears to the profeſſor to be only an argument *ad invidiam:* and the ſame might, he thinks, be uſed to reduce the oppoſers of ſubſcriptions to the *diſagreeable* dilemma of *holding*, either that they muſt lay aſide preaching and only read the bible to their congregations, or elſe that new and unſcriptural words will better explain the ſenſe of ſcripture-doctrines, than the words of Chriſt and his apoſtles. No; ſay you; [1] "the "two caſes cannot be ſimilar: for does the profeſſor "know any oppoſers, who hold, that new and un- "ſcriptural words uſed in popular diſcourſes will *fix the* "*ſenſe* of ſcripture-doctrines better than the words of "Chriſt and his apoſtles; or will *fix it* at all?" that is, unleſs the two caſes are the ſame, they cannot be ſimilar. Have a little patience however, and we ſhall find preſently by your good help, that *fixing* and *explaining* are the ſame. In the mean time let us hear, why "it is little "to the purpoſe to ſay, if the ſenſe of ſcripture may "be expreſſed more plainly, why not more pre- "ciſely, than in the words of Chriſt and his apoſtles?" the reaſon is, becauſe "*the contraſt* is not between the "words *plainly* and *preciſely*, but between the words "*expreſſed* and *fixed*." An admirable reaſon, no doubt, if one could but underſtand it. *Better to fix*, in the common acceptation of the words, is *to expreſs more preciſely*; and *better to explain* is *to expreſs more plainly*. You may therefore ſhew at your leiſure by your doctrine of *contraſts*, why it is not as invidious to ſay, the ſenſe of ſcripture may be *better explained*, as to ſay, it may be *better fixed*, in new and unſcriptural words, than in the words of Chriſt and his apoſtles.

Having taken the biſhop in your hand thus far; upon finding yourſelf hard preſſed, you leave him to take care of himſelf, and introduce a new ſtate of the queſtion of your own. "The difference between the oppoſers and "defenders of ſubſcriptions is occaſioned," you ſay, "by "the latters pretending to fix the ſenſe of ſcripture by new "and

[1] Conf. p. 24. n.

" and unſcriptural words in eſtabliſhed confeſſions *to the* " *excluſion of the right of private judgment.*" The prelates *contraſt* therefore, between new and unſcriptural words on the one part, and the words of Chriſt and his apoſtles on the other, was mere parade; and his antagoniſts were weak men to be ſilenced by it: you have found out the giſt of the cauſe to be *the fixing* of the ſenſe of ſcripture by new and unſcriptural words *to the excluſion of the right of private judgment*; which excluſion is neither mentioned nor hinted at in the argument, with which his lordſhip ſtopped their clamour.

As the queſtion, after you have modelled it, appears in ſuch a different ſhape; " why ſhould not the profeſſor " have the privilege" of conſulting the confeſſional again? Here he finds, that what the biſhop calls [2] " *fix-* " *ing the ſenſe of ſcripture-doctrine* by new and unſcrip- " tural words," you call [3] " *the explication of points of* " *faith* by new and unſcriptural phraſes." To your queſtion therefore, " Does the profeſſor know any op- " poſers, who hold, that new and unſcriptural words " uſed by preachers in popular diſcourſes will *fix the* " *ſenſe of ſcripture-doctrines* better than the words of " Chriſt and his apoſtles, or will *fix it* at all?" he now anſwers, that he knows one. You hold, [4] that the *explication of points* of faith delivered by paſtors and teachers in familiar, clear, and uſual forms of ſpeech are more profitable to the hearers, than the bare reading of thoſe parts of the bible, in which they are contained, that is, than the propoſing of them in the words, which Chriſt and his apoſtles made uſe of: and with you the *explication of points of faith* and the *fixing the ſenſe of ſcripture doctrines* is the ſame thing. But he need not be at the trouble of " tacking together two " things, which are at the diſtance of *eight lines* from one " another:" in the note now under conſideration, you ſay, that [5] " you do not differ from him about endea- " vour-

2 Conf. p. 22. 3 Conf. ibid. 4 Conf. p. 61. 5 Conf. p. 24. n.

" vouring to make the ſenſe of ſcripture either *more* " *plain* or *more preciſe*" [that is, about endeavouring either to *explain it better* or to *fix it better*] " in a popular diſ- " courſe." This is plainly an overture towards an accommodation. For if this may be done in a popular diſcourſe, why not in an eſtabliſhed confeſſion? "A po- " pular diſcourſe," you ſay, " precludes no man from re- " jecting the preachers ſenſe, if his own judgment leads " him another way." Nor are ſuch confeſſions, as the profeſſor defends, eſtabliſhed to the excluſion of the rights of private judgment: [6] no church has on his principles a right to uſe its eſtabliſhed confeſſion as a law, to compel any one to aſſent to the propoſitions contained in it, whoſe judgment has led him another way, but only as a teſt to diſcover, whether the judgment of thoſe, who are candidates for the office of public teaching, has led them to aſſent to it, or not. Thus, whatever may become of the reſt, one " *poor oppoſer has* " *been ſo twiſted in the profeſſors dilemma*," as to be forced at laſt to make up matters with him on the ſubject of it.

XV. When theſe objectors come to explain themſelves; they do not ſeem to mean, that the ſenſe of ſcripture can not, but that it ought not, to be more exactly fixed, than it is in the words of ſcripture. For they ſometimes make it matter of complaint, that any church ſhould " " require aſſent to a certain ſenſe of ſcripture " excluſive of all other ſenſes;" becauſe this cannot, they ſay, be done " without an unwarrant- " able interference with the rights of private " judgment, which are manifeſtly ſecured to " every individual by the ſcriptural terms of " chriſtian liberty." But can any one imagine,

[6] See parag. V.

that Chriſt and his apoſtles purpoſely delivered their doctrines in ſuch expreſſions, as would admit of different interpretations, that each particular perſon might interpret them for himſelf, and might, in determining what his faith ſhould be, have a variety to chuſe out of? If this was not their deſign; if they intended, as certainly they did intend, not to leave any ſuch ambiguities in their diſcourſes or writings, but to deliver a fixed and certain religion to all mankind, and to oblige all thoſe to "have one faith, who profeſs to have one Lord; though the cunning craftineſs of deſigning interpreters may have found out a variety of ſenſes for any paſſages of ſcripture, yet the terms, which ſecure to each chriſtian the right of intrepreting them for himſelf, cannot without impropriety be called the ſcriptural terms of chriſtian liberty: they ſhould rather be called the natural terms of an accidental liberty, which belongs to chriſtians in their preſent ſituation. But whatever names we may make uſe of, the queſtion is, whether this liberty, call it how we will, is not unwarrantably interfered with by requiring chriſtians to aſſent to any certain ſenſe of ſcripture, where they are perſuaded, that it will admit of other ſenſes, and have a right to judge for themſelves, which is the true one? The anſwer is obvious. No chriſtian is required to ſubſcribe to ſuch confeſſions, as I am ſpeaking of, who is not in his own private judgment convinced, that they are agreeable to the word of God. On the contrary; as they are deſign-

deſigned to be teſts, by which the governours of the church may find out, whether they, who deſire to be appointed paſtors and teachers, aſſent to the faith and doctrines contained in them, or not; whoever ſubſcribes to them, when he does not aſſent to them, fruſtrates the purpoſe, for which they were eſtabliſhed.

[u] Confeſſional. p. 32. [v] Epheſ. iv. 5.

In your note on this paragraph, after ſpending ſome time and paper about what you own to be nothing to the purpoſe, you do me a very unuſual favour by [7] "giving me a direct anſwer. No body," you ſay, "that you know, does imagine it was the deſign of "Chriſt and his apoſtles to deliver their doctrines in "ſuch expreſſions, as would admit of different inter-"pretations, that each perſon might interpret them for "himſelf, and might, in determining what his faith "ſhould be, have a variety to chuſe out of." But becauſe Chillingworth ſpeaks of [8] "*that liberty, wherein* "*Chriſt and his apoſtles left the underſtandings of men*," you think, that a liberty, in which, as you confeſs, Chriſt and his apoſtles did *not* leave the underſtandings of men, but which was accidentally introduced, may on his authority be called ſcriptural liberty.

Having happily ſettled the queſtion about the propriety of the name by ſo appoſite an example, you come to the queſtion about the thing;——"Whether "this liberty, call it how you will, is not unwarrant-"ably interfered with by requiring chriſtians to aſſent "to any certain ſenſe of ſcripture, when they are per-"ſuaded, that it will admit of other ſenſes, and have "a right to judge for themſelves, which is the true "one? You ſuſpect, unwillingly indeed, that I might "poſſibly attempt to evade the force of the queſtion, in "which the term is *aſſent*, under the cover of the word

 "*ſub-*

7 Conf. p. 48. n. 8 Conf. p. 49. n.

" *ſubſcribe* in the anſwer." Do you therefore know any proteſtants, who are required *by church-governours* to aſſent to any confeſſion, without being required to ſubſcribe to it, or however to make a ſolemn declaration of aſſent, which in your opinion, amounts to the ſame thing? If you do not, the word *ſubſcribe* in the anſwer will be equivalent to the word *aſſent* in the queſtion.

Well, but [9] " if lay-chriſtians, who are not required " to ſubſcribe to the confeſſion, are not required to aſ- " ſent; how can the governours of the church under- " ſtand them to be bound in conſcience to believe it, " as much as the clergy, who do ſubſcribe it; as the " profeſſor aſſerts [1] in the very next page of his diſ- " courſe?" Whenever we purſue one of your arguments, we always find it turning and doubling in a fallacy of ſome kind or other. A man cannot be underſtood to be bound in conſcience to believe a propoſition, to which *nothing* requires him to aſſent: but he may be underſtood to be bound in conſcience to believe a propoſition, to which *the governours of the church* do not require him to aſſent. [2] The examiner, good man! " preaches " ſuch doctrine to his pariſhioners, as he underſtands " to be agreeable to the word of God; but he does " not underſtand it to be ſuch, as they are bound in con- " ſcience to believe:" for he, [3] though not fond of diſtinctions, has contrived to diſtinguiſh in this inſtance between what he thinks chriſtians are bound in conſcience to believe, and what he thinks agreeable to the word of God. But church-governours, when they ſet forth ſuch a confeſſion, as they underſtand to be agreeable to the word of God, for want of being acquainted with this diſtinction, underſtand, that *the word of God* requires all chriſtians to believe and aſſent to it; though *they* require only thoſe, who are to be appointed public teachers, to declare their aſſent by ſubſcribing it.

" There

9 Conf. p. 49. 50. n. 1 See parag. XVII. 2 Letter *occaſioned* &c. p. 57. Conf. ad. pref. p. vii.

4 " There are then, it ſeems, chriſtians of one claſs, " who are required *by church-governours* both to aſſent " and ſubſcribe to a certain ſenſe of ſcripture expreſſed " in ſuch confeſſions." Indeed! what, whether they are in their own private judgment convinced, or not, that the confeſſion is agreeable to the truth of the goſpel? The governours of the church require the public paſtors and teachers to aſſent to the eſtabliſhed confeſſion; that is, they require, that thoſe, who are to be admitted into this claſs, ſhould be ſuch, as aſſent to it: and the deſign of the confeſſion is to prevent any chriſtians from being admitted, who are not perſuaded in their own minds, that the ſenſe of ſcripture expreſſed in it is the true one.

" But what right have church-governours to inter- " fere with the private judgment of theſe, any more " than with the private judgment of any other chri- " ſtians? The profeſſor," you ſay, " *anſwers*, that theſe " confeſſions are deſigned to be teſts, by which the go- " vernours of the church *may find out*, whether they, " who deſire to be appointed paſtors and teachers, *af- " ſent* to the faith and doctrines contained in them or " not." How ſo? does not the profeſſor tell you in ſo many words, that " *the obvious anſwer is*; No chriſ- " tian is required to ſubſcribe to ſuch confeſſions, who " is not in his own conſcience convinced, that they are " agreeable to the word of God?" What you think proper to call my anſwer is plainly deſigned as a proof, not that church-governours have a right to interfere with the liberty of private judgment, by requiring aſ- ſent to a certain ſenſe of ſcripture excluſive of all other ſenſes, but that they do not pretend to, or exerciſe ſuch a right, when they require thoſe, who are to be ap- pointed public paſtors and teachers, to ſubſcribe to an eſtabliſhed confeſſion. No matter for that. The ground, which you had taken in the confeſſional, could be maintained no longer; and this manœuvre was con- trived to change it: for thus you go on; " What is all " this

4 Conf. p. 50. n.

" this to the right *thus* to interfere? Where is the war-
" rant of the church-governours to *find this out?*" As if the queſtion had been; not about *interfering with the rights or liberty* of private judgment, by requiring the candidates to aſſent to a certain ſenſe of ſcripture excluſive of all others; but about *interfering, with you do not ſay what,* in order to find out, whether their private judgment, in the full and free uſe of it, has led them to aſſent to this ſenſe of ſcripture, or not. The word *interference,* which I tranſcribed from the confeſſional into my diſcourſe, is a very convenient one, and favours this change of the queſtion. *To interfere,* ſignifies both *to counteract,* and *to interpoſe:* and by the help of this word you have endeavoured, as well as you could, to hide the difference between counteracting the rights of private judgment, and interpoſing to find out the determinations of private judgment. The warrant of church-governours *thus to interpoſe* in the caſe of public paſtors and teachers, [5] had been ſettled before, and been ſhewn to be grounded on the nature of their office, and the precepts of an apoſtle, or, if you will give me leave to ſuppoſe with Chillingworth, that what was written by one, was approved by all, on the precepts of the apoſtles, and in the next paragraph but one is ſhewn not to extend to the laity. As long as a chriſtian continues in a private ſtation in the church; the determination of his judgment about the faith and doctrines, which he ought to hold, is a matter of private concern; he alone is accountable to God for it, and the governours of the church have no right to ſearch into it: but when he is to be appointed a public teacher, it then becomes a matter of public concern; and the governours of the church are warranted by the nature of their duty, and by ſcripture-precepts, to find it out, and to judge of it.

But you have invented an argument, which will make ſhort work with this warrant: and here it comes in

5 See parag. III. V. X. XI.

in the ſhape of a dilemma. [6] " If the faith and doc-
" trines, contained in theſe confeſſions, are different
" from the faith and doctrines contained in the ſcrip-
" tures, the governours of the church have no *ſcriptu-*
" *ral* warrant for impoſing any ſuch teſt." This horn of your dilemma is a deſperate one, and unleſs you can find ſome weak place in it, will overſet the doctrine of ſincerity.——If the faith and doctrines holden by private proteſtants is different from the faith and doctrines contained in the ſcriptures, they have no *ſcriptural* warrant to hold them. I will leave you to find out the weak place, and will paſs on to the other horn. " If the
" faith and doctrines contained in theſe confeſſions are
" the ſame with the faith and doctrines contained in
" the ſcriptures;—— then, ſay you, " the requiring
" an aſſent to the latter will *enable* the governours
" of the church to *find out* as much to the full, as they
" are warranted to find out;"—— then, ſay I, it will coſt you more years, than you employed in preparing the *confeſſional* for the public, to prove, that, though they are warranted to require aſſent to the ſcriptures, they are not warranted to require aſſent to ſuch confeſſions.

" Be it obſerved;" for thus you conclude this long note; " that the right of interfering is wholly built
" upon the right of finding out what they never can
" find out," [you ſhould have ſaid, never can find out *infallibly*;] " unleſs ſubſcription to the confeſſion is an
" infallible teſt: for it is not a clear caſe, that any one,
" who ſubſcribes to the confeſſion, aſſents to every
" thing contained in it. And what," as you add, " is
" the conſequence? Why, truly he fruſtrates the pur-
" poſe, for which confeſſions were eſtabliſhed. And is
" not this *fruſtration* a poſſible caſe?" Whether the governours of the church can have no right of uſing any teſt, unleſs it is an infallible one, which will give them a *perfect* aſſurance of the ſincerity of the candidates,

[6] Conf. p. 50. n.

dates, has been [7] already conſidered. As to the reſt; my arguments will not ſhift about ſo faſt, as you ſhift the queſtion. This *fruſtration*, which you talk of, though it will not prove, that every one, who ſubſcribes a confeſſion, aſſents to every thing contained in it, will however prove all, that it was alledged to prove. If he, who ſubſcribes to a confeſſion without aſſenting to it, fruſtrates the purpoſe, for which it was eſtabliſhed; we may be ſure, that it was not eſtabliſhed for the purpoſe of requiring any one to ſubſcribe to it, who is not convinced by his own judgment, that the faith and doctrines contained in it are agreeable to the word of God.

XVI. " In reſpect" of all other members of the church, that is, [w] " of the laity; they are " nothing more, than articles of church-com- " munion:" by which I mean, not as a learned prelate, when he ſays this of the xxxix articles of our own church, has been ſuppoſed to mean, " that all laymen [x] are required either to ſub- " ſcribe or ſolemnly declare their aſſent to them, " as a qualification for communion with the " church, in which they are eſtabliſhed;" but [y] as he has very clearly explained himſelf, that every layman, who is a member of any church, not only if he is perſuaded, that all the propoſitions contained in its eſtabliſhed confeſſion are true, but, " if he thinks, that none of them " are erroneous in ſo high a degree, that he " cannot hold communion with ſuch as profeſs " them, is obliged to continue in its commu- " nion."

[w] Burnets introduction to his expoſition of the xxxix articles. p. 6. [x] Confeſſional. p. 93. [y] Burnet ibid.

[7] See above at p. 66. 67. 68.

" You

[8] "You wiſh the profeſſor hath not here ſuppoſed biſhop "Burnet to mean what he did not mean." To ſhew you, that you have your wiſh, I will tranſcribe the biſhops words at large. "As to the laity, and the whole body of "the people; certainly to them theſe [articles of the "church of England] are only articles of church-com- "munion; ſo that every perſon, who does not think, that "there is ſome propoſition in them, that is erroneous to "ſo high a degree, that he cannot hold communion "with ſuch, as profeſs it, is obliged to continue in our "communion." "You wiſh beſides, that the profeſſor "would endeavour to underſtand his opponents before "he undertakes to repreſent them." By tranſcribing your own words I will ſhew you, that I have not miſrepreſented you; if you underſtand yourſelf. [9] "The biſhop," you ſay, "proceeds to tell us, that, with reſpect to the "laity, they are only articles of church-communion: "But you would deſire to know, what layman is, or "ever was, required either to ſubſcribe or ſolemnly de- "clare his aſſent to them, as a qualification for com- "munion with the church of England?" You introduce the biſhop calling them articles of church-communion, and then without ſaying a word about the ſenſe, in which he had explained himſelf, you proceed to argue againſt him, that they cannot be articles of church-communion, becauſe no laymen are required to ſubſcribe or ſolemnly declare their aſſent to them, as a qualification for communion. Either therefore you did ſuppoſe the biſhops meaning to be what I ſay you did; or elſe you intended, that the readers of the *confeſſional* ſhould ſuppoſe this to be his meaning, though you knew it was not. Chuſe whether of the two you like beſt.

[1] But "the profeſſor, by adopting biſhop Burnets "opinion, has," if we may believe you, "introduced "two counter-obligations, and ſo ruined his whole ſyſ-

8 Conf. p. 117. 118. n. 9 Conf. p. 117. 1 Conf. p. 118. 119. 120. n.

" tem." I cannot promiſe to underſtand you here: but I will do my endeavour; and you are ſo reaſonable as to require no more. One of theſe ſuppoſed counter-obligations is without doubt the obligation of the laity in any church to continue in the communion of it; if they think none of the articles of its confeſſion ſo erroneous, that they cannot hold communion with ſuch, as profeſs them. The difficulty is to find out the other. Whatever it is; you endeavour to deduce it from the firſt ſentence of my next paragraph; —" The governours of the church, " though they do not bind the laity to ſubſcribe to the " eſtabliſhed confeſſion, underſtand them to be bound " in conſcience, as much as the clergy, to believe and " practiſe what is contained in it." Here indeed is ſome mention of a binding or obligation in conſcience: but this obligation, whether the laity underſtand themſelves, or are only underſtood by the governours of the church, to be thus obliged, is plainly no counter-obligation to the former. You argue however from this ſentence, " that the governours of the church, if they " underſtand the laity to be bound in conſcience, as " much as the clergy, to believe and practiſe what is " contained in the eſtabliſhed confeſſion, muſt under- " ſtand it to be as much a teſt to the laity, as to the " clergy, and conſequently muſt have as much *right* to " exclude the unaſſenting layman from the commu- " nion, as the unſubſcribing clergyman from the office " of teaching." Poſſibly you might miſtake *a right* for *an obligation*. Let us ſee therefore, how you make out *this right* from my principles. Why, " the " governours of the church muſt have a right to ex- " clude the unaſſenting layman from the communion, " if the confeſſion is a teſt." But on my principles, as explained in the laſt ſentence of the ſame paragraph, they have no right to know, what determination the private judgment of a layman has led him to, and conſequently have no right to uſe the confeſſion as a teſt in

reſpect of the laity: unleſs indeed you have found out a ſort of teſt, which is not a means of trial.

XVII. But here it is objected, that, [z] "if the "laity are allowed not to be bound by church-"confeſſions, the right to eſtabliſh them for "the clergy, as well as for the laity, is given "up: becauſe whatever is ſufficient to direct the "faith and practice of the one, will be ſufficient "to direct the teaching of the other; unleſs "the clergy may be obliged to teach doctrines, "which the laity are not obliged either to be-"lieve or practiſe."—As if the governours of the church, becauſe they do not bind the laity to ſubſcribe to the eſtabliſhed confeſſion, did not underſtand them to be bound in conſcience, as much as the clergy, to believe and practiſe what is contained in it. A rule, which they ſet forth to direct the teaching of the one, cannot but be intended by them to direct the faith and practice of the other. In this rule they propoſe to all, who are members of the church, wherein they preſide, to the laity as well as to the clergy, ſuch a ſummary of the religion of Chriſt, as every chriſtian, according to the beſt of their judgment, is bound in conſcience to aſſent to. When they have done this, they leave every man to judge and determine for himſelf, whether it is ſuch an one, as he ought to aſſent to, or not. But it is their duty to take care, that the people ſhould be inſtructed in what they judge to be the true faith and doctrine of the goſpel. This gives them a right to require thoſe, whom they appoint paſtors and teach-

ers, to ſubſcribe to this ſummary: becauſe they have a right to know, what theſe have determined in the caſe; whether agreeably to the command of St. Paul, [a] they hold faſt the faithful word, as they have been taught, the myſtery of the faith in a pure conſcience; and are therefore likely to diſtribute no other word, but [b] the word of truth. Of the laity they do not require this ſubſcription: becauſe, after they have taken care, that theſe ſhould be duly inſtructed, their duty extends no farther, and therefore gives them no right to know, what determination the private judgment of any one in this rank may have led him to.

[z] Confeſſional. p. 27. 28. [a] Tit. i. 5. 9. 1 Tim. iii. 9. [b] 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[2] Your friend the *incomparable* doctor, in his letter *occaſioned* by my ſecond vindication, repreſents me, as "declaring here, that every layman, who aſſents not "to every article of an eſtabliſhed confeſſion is a vio-"lator of his conſcience." But he is not to be regarded: for having found, how ill he ſucceeded in the character of an examiner, he is now become a mere angry declamer, and ſays any thing, which his diſtreſs ſuggeſts. You, though not leſs diſtreſſed, deal more in chicane, which is not ſo eaſily ſeen through by every reader, as wild declamation. [3] "The governours of "the church underſtand the laity to be as much bound "in conſcience as the clergy to believe and practiſe "what is contained in the eſtabliſhed confeſſion; and "yet it ſeems," ſay you, "that after the governours of "the church have ſet forth this confeſſion, as a rule to "direct the faith and practice of the laity, they leave "every man to judge and determine for himſelf, whe-"ther

2 Letter *occaſioned* &c. p. 46. 3 Conf. p. 37. n.

" ther it is ſuch an one, as he ought to aſſent to." Pray; why not? Though the governours of the church underſtand, that is, ſee ſuch reaſons as perſuade them, that the confeſſion, which they ſet forth, is agreeable to the word of God, and conſequently that every chriſtian is bound in conſcience to aſſent to it; yet, knowing their judgment to be fallible, they leave every man to the dictates of his own judgment to determine, whether he underſtands himſelf to be bound in conſcience to aſſent to it, or not. " That is," ſay you, " *every layman*: " for the clergyman, having *already* aſſented to this " confeſſion, is *not* left to judge and determine for him- " ſelf." When was this ſame *already?* was it before the confeſſion was ſet forth?——I gueſs you mean, before he was appointed a clergyman. If you do, you might have told your ſtory better. But to let this paſs: your *already*, when thus explained, will ſhew you, that there was a time, when this clergyman was a layman: and will you tell us, that he was *not* at this time left to judge and determine for himſelf, like other laymen? Well, but " the layman is left thus to judge and determine " to the end of his life, without any requiſition on the " part of church-governours to ſubſcribe or declare his " aſſent to the confeſſion."——This by the way is as it happens; for the clergyman, you may remember, was a layman once: a layman therefore may in ſome part of his life deſire to be appointed a public teacher; and then a declaration of aſſent, or a ſubſcription, will be required of him. But we muſt not ſtand with you for trifles: and, if we will ſuppoſe you to mean a layman, who chuſes to continue ſuch, as long as he lives, then you go on, and aſk, " how in this caſe thoſe go- " vernours can poſſibly underſtand this layman to be as " much bound in conſcience to believe and practiſe, " what is contained in the confeſſion, as the clergyman, " who has ſolemnly ſubſcribed and declared his aſſent " to it?" Nothing ſo eaſy; provided, they have common ſenſe enough to know the difference between what

they

they underſtand themſelves, and what this clergyman, or this layman, underſtands. According to the beſt of their judgment, the confeſſion is agreeable to the truth of the goſpel, and therefore is ſuch an one, that both the clergyman and the layman are bound to aſſent to it. The clergymans ſubſcription is an evidence to them, that his judgment in the caſe is the ſame as their own: and though they have no evidence of what the laymans judgment has led him to determine, and no right to require any; yet their own is not affected by the want of it. "But," ſay you, "upon this very determination, which" they do not know, and "have no right to know, "the obligation of the laymans conſcience depends:" the amount of which obſervation is, what I hinted to you juſt now,—becauſe they do not know, and have no right to know, how he underſtands the matter; therefore they cannot know, how they underſtand it themſelves.

When you find your objection at its laſt gaſp; you may perhaps be willing to diſtinguiſh, [4] as the *examiner* does amongſt the good people of *Burgh* between ſuch faith and doctrines, as he underſtands to be agreeable to the word of God, and ſuch faith and doctrines, as he underſtands chriſtians to be bound in conſcience to believe and practiſe: and this diſtinction may at firſt ſight pleaſe you the better; becauſe it is ſuch an one, [5] "as "will" *not* "paſs with applauſe in the ſchools for ſound "and ſcientific." But have a care, how you call him in to your aſſiſtance: for he will do you more harm than good. [6] "He preaches ſuch doctrine to his pa- "riſhioners, as he in his conſcience believes to be a- "greeable to the word of God," and therefore ſuch, I will for once preſume, as he thinks himſelf obliged to preach. Here therefore in the pariſh of the examiner, if you admit his diſtinction, you will meet with what your argument ſuppoſes to be ſuch a ſoleciſm in religion, that your adverſaries will not venture to maintain

4 Letter *occaſioned* &c. p. 57. 5 Conf. ad. pref. p. vii.
6 Letter *occaſioned* &c. p. 57. See above at p. 84.

tain it, [7] *the clergyman obliged to teach doctrines, which he does not underſtand the laity to be obliged either to believe or practiſe.*

XVIII. You will excuſe me, I hope, if I treſpaſs upon your patience a little longer, whilſt [c] I " conſider this matter with reſpect to " the effects of it on chriſtian ſocieties. The " queſtion here is, how ſhall one church exer- " ciſe its right of requiring ſubſcription to its " own eſtabliſhed confeſſion without encroach- " ing on the right of another? all proteſtant " churches having the ſame right in an equal " degree; how is it poſſible for any church to " exerciſe it in thoſe inſtances, where ſhe eſta- " bliſhes doctrines inconſiſtent with the do- " ctrines of other churches, without abridging " thoſe others of their right to eſtabliſh their " own doctrines?" Hitherto there is no great difficulty in the objection. [d] Separate churches are, in reſpect of one another, like ſeparate men. If each individual proteſtant holds his religion independently of all others, ſo does each particular proteſtant church. Any church therefore by determining for itſelf, what faith and doctrines it ought to teach, no more encroaches upon the right of other churches, which differ from it, to do the ſame thing, than any individual by exerciſing his right of private judgment in determining, what faith and doctrines he ought to hold, precludes others, who are not of the ſame opinion with him, from exerciſing theirs.

[c] Confeſſional. p. 33. [d] Locke on toleration. v. ii. p. 256.

" Our

7 Conf. p. 37.

7 " Our profeſſor," as you tell us in your preface, " to get rid of a difficulty he met with in the *confeſſional*, " hath thought fit to ſay; *ſeparate churches are in reſpect* " *of one another, &c.*" Theſe are only peeviſh words, and might have been omitted without hurting either your cauſe or your credit: we will therefore paſs them over, and go on to what follows.

You once, it ſeems, " ſuſpected, the IF in this paſ- " ſage, *If each individual proteſtant, &c*, to be meant for a " drawback upon the conceſſion in caſe of need:" for you had not logic enough to teach you better. But 8 " you will " not," you ſay, " ſuſpect it now; becauſe I have referred " the examiner to this paſſage as an expreſs declaration, " that each particular proteſtant church holds its religion " independently of all others." Any one elſe therefore would have thought it not worth mentioning; ſince by your own confeſſion it is now a mere cavil, whatever it was before.

You have ſomething farther to ſay to the profeſſor. 9 How " can each particular proteſtant church hold its " religion independently of ALL others, if, as he af- " firms elſewhere, every particular church is a part of " the univerſal viſible church inſtituted by Chriſt him- " himſelf?" 1 But the profeſſor has already reconciled theſe two propoſitions, as you direct, " without re- " tracting or quibbling away either of them." And as this was done by a ſmall hint about grammar, it may not be very pleaſant to you to ſee the word ALL again in capitals; now you find, that this preeminence, which you intended ſhould point out an inconſiſtency in the profeſſor, only ſerved to point out a blunder of your own.

XIX. Nor ſhall we find the difficulty much greater, if we go on with the objector. e " No " church

7 Conf. ad. præf. p. xxiv. 8 Second vindication. p. 20.
9 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxv. 1 See above at p. 30.

" church, he ſays, can have a right to eſtabliſh " any doctrines, but upon ſuppoſition, that " they are true. If the doctrines eſtabliſhed " in one church are true; the contrary do- " ctrines eſtabliſhed in another church muſt be " falſe: and no church can contend for a right " to eſtabliſh falſe doctrines." Let us try the ſame argument in a ſimilar inſtance. No man can have a right to hold any doctrines, but upon ſuppoſition of their truth. If the doctrines, which any one man holds, be true; the contrary doctrines holden by another man muſt be falſe: and no man can have a right to receive and maintain a falſhood. This way of reaſoning will equally conclude againſt both rights, or againſt neither. They therefore, who make uſe of it, muſt either give up the right, which they claim for particular perſons, or elſe muſt allow it to be inſufficient to ſet aſide the right, which we claim for particular churches. A very common diſtinction will clear up this matter. No church has a right to eſtabliſh, as no individual has a right to hold, falſe doctrines, as falſe doctrines. But if either a proteſtant church, or an individual proteſtant, ſhould after due conſideration be perſuaded, that any doctrines are true, which in reality are falſe; either the right of a church, acting under this perſuaſion, to provide for and ſecure the public teaching of theſe doctrines, which in the preſent queſtion is all, that we mean by a right to eſtabliſh them, muſt be well founded; or an individual acting under the

ſame perſuaſion, can have no right to hold them.

e Confeſſional. p. 33. 34.

I cannot find, that I have ventured to determine, what the author of the *confeſſional* means by *eſtabliſhing doctrines:* and yet after quoting the latter half of this paragraph, beginning at —— *A very common diſtinction,*— you break out into this ſoliloquy,— [2] "How "much is a controverſial writer at his eaſe, when he "takes the liberty to make his own caſe, and to apply "to it his own diſtinctions! And is this in truth ALL, "that the author of the *confeſſional* means by a right "to eſtabliſh theſe doctrines!" A controverſial writer is at liberty, one would hope, to explain what he means, and what he believes other writers on the ſame ſide of the queſtion mean, by the words, which he makes uſe of. This I have done, and nothing more than this; where I ſay, that "a right to provide for and ſecure "the public teaching of theſe doctrines is all, that *we* "mean in the preſent queſtion by a right to eſtabliſh "them." But becauſe I ſay, *we*, you would have it ſuppoſed, that I muſt needs mean you and myſelf. I preſume, you read the whole paragraph before you wrote about it: and if you had begun your quotation a ſentence higher, your readers might have ſeen ſomething, which would have ſhewn them, that the word *we* does not neceſſarily include the author of the *confeſſional:* for no one can imagine, that I mean to repreſent you as claiming for particular churches the ſame right, which I claim for them.

But whatever I, and other defenders of ſubſcriptions, may mean by the right of eſtabliſhing doctrines; "does "not the author of the *confeſſional* plainly mean a right "pretended to in any one particular church to eſtabliſh "its own *peculiar* doctrines, as ſtandards of orthodoxy "for the whole body of proteſtants?" Not; if he underſtands

2 Conf. p. 52. n.

ſtands his own ſtate of the queſtion. Let him ſpeak for himſelf. I love to treat with principals, and ſhall conſider you at preſent in the under-character of a commentator: he has told his ſtory plainly, and we ſhall ſee his meaning better, if we read what he ſays in the text, than if we look at it through the medium of your notes. [3]" Suppoſe," ſays he, " that proteſtant churches " have ſuch a right [[4]of requiring aſſent to a certain " ſenſe of ſcripture excluſive of other ſenſes] *each* " *within its own confines:* The queſtion is, how ſhall one " church exerciſe this right" [obſerve; this right *limited to its own confines*] " without encroaching on the right " of another?" His arguments to prove on the one hand, that this right [a right of *each church within its own confines*] cannot be exerciſed by any one church without encroaching on the like right of other churches, are fairly quoted in this and the foregoing paragraph; and I have ſhewn on the contrary, that one church by requiring thoſe, who are appointed paſtors and teachers in it, to ſubſcribe to its own confeſſion, does not encroach on the right of any other church to do the ſame thing. Here the commentator ſteps in, and finding his author unable to keep the field, endeavours to cover his retreat, not indeed by oppoſing himſelf in the notes to my argument, whilſt he of the text retires, but by raiſing a duſt with ſome complaints, which the other has made about the manner, in which he apprehends this right to have been exerciſed in fact, " where there are more than one church in the ſame " proteſtant ſtate," and in which he charitably ſuppoſes, " it would have been exerciſed by proteſtant churches " of different ſtates, if their powers had not been li- " mited by their ſituation." This duſt, which was raiſed in favour of the author, has hindered the commentator from ſeeing, that, if a right of each proteſtant church to provide for and ſecure *within its own confines* the public teaching of thoſe doctrines, which it

 judges

3 Conf. p. 51. 4 Conf. p. 47. 48.

judges to be agreeable to the truth of the goſpel, is allowed to be ſuch an one, as does not in itſelf encroach upon the right of other proteſtant churches to do the ſame thing, or break in upon their co-ordination; this is all, that I contend for. The manner, in which this right may have been exerciſed in fact, and conjectures about the manner, in which, if ſome accident or other had not ſtood in the way, it would have been exerciſed, are, as far as I am concerned, nothing to the purpoſe. I muſt however deſire you to remember, that [5] "the principle of "co-ordination" amongſt proteſtant churches does not appear to me to require, that "no one proteſtant "church ſhould eſtabliſh any doctrines" *within its own confines*, "but by the unanimous conſent of all the reſt:" nor can you maintain ſuch a principle of co-ordination without giving up the independency of each.

You have in this note, it muſt be owned, carried a very even hand thus far between me and the author of the *confeſſional*; and have, though with different views indeed, miſrepreſented each of us once, But before you finiſh it, you have [6] "one word more with the profeſſor," which will turn the ſcale on his ſide. "You are afraid, I "may have forgotten, that my particular churches are "not like Lockes voluntary ſocieties, where the con-"ſent of *all* the members muſt be had in order to eſta-"bliſh any thing, and in that reſpect may each of them "be compared to an individual proteſtant with ſuffici-"ent propriety. Whereas my particular churches," in your repreſentation of them, "have rulers and go-"vernors appointed under Chriſt inveſted with *a right* "independent of the lay-members to eſtabliſh *whatſo-"ever* they may judge *expedient for them.*" As if it depended upon the different internal conſtitutions of government received in different ſocieties, whether they can, or cannot, be conſidered as individuals. [7] Locke tells us, that "what he ſays concerning the mutual tolera-"tion

5 Conf. p. 53. 6 Conf. p. 53. n. 7 Lockes works. v. ii. p. 256.

" tion of private perſons differing from one another in " religion, he underſtands alſo of particular churches, " which ſtand, as it were, in the ſame relation to each " other, as private perſons among themſelves." But, you, I find, would confine his principles of mutual toleration in reſpect of particular churches to thoſe only, in which nothing can be eſtabliſhed without the direct and immediate conſent of *all* the members: for you cannot extend it to others of a different internal conſtitution, without allowing, that theſe too may in his opinion be compared to individual proteſtants.

But let us look into the internal conſtitution of his voluntary ſocieties, and into your repreſentation of my particular churches. [8] " The right of making laws for " ſuch a ſociety can," he ſays, " belong to none but " the ſociety itſelf, or at leaſt, which is the ſame thing, " to thoſe, whom the ſociety by common conſent has " authoriſed thereunto."

Now we are taught in the ſcriptures, and he does not deny, that Chriſt has " all power in heaven and in " earth," and that " God has given him to be" the ſupreme lawgiver and judge of all, " the head over all " things unto the church." Theſe ſocieties therefore, when their conſtitution is the moſt popular, can govern themſelves no otherwiſe, than in ſubordination to Chriſt: and if any of them have by common conſent authoriſed any particular perſons to make laws for them, theſe rulers and governours can be no otherwiſe appointed, than *under Chriſt*.

Well, but they may be laymen. May they ſo? and may not they be clergymen? Locke has ſaid nothing, which will confine his voluntary ſocieties, or, as he ſometimes calls them, *particular churches*, in their choice of governours to one of theſe claſſes of men, more than to the other: the perſons, by whom they conſent to have their laws made, may, conſiſtently with his idea of a particular church, be all laymen, or all clergymen, or a mixture of both.

But

8 Lockes works, v. ii. p. 254.

But does he ſuppoſe theſe rulers and governours to have a right to make laws independent of the lay-members, if they are all clergymen, or of the other members, if they are either all laymen, or a mixture of both orders?—Whatever conſent might be neceſſary in the firſt inſtance to authoriſe them to make laws; the notion of being authoriſed implies, that they have afterwards a right to make them without the direct and immediate concurrence of the other members.

Locke however has provided for the religious liberty of the ſeveral members of a particular church in caſe the authoriſed governours of it ſhould eſtabliſh any thing, which does not appear to them to be agreeable to the word of God. [9] "The hopes of ſalvation," ſays he, "as it was the only cauſe of a mans entrance into "a particular communion, ſo it can be the only reaſon "of his ſtay there; for if afterwards he diſcover any "thing, either erroneous in the doctrine, or incongru-"ous in the worſhip of that ſociety, to which he has "joined himſelf; why ſhould it not be as free for him "to go out as it was to enter?" In like manner, when the [1]examiner enquired, "what the people are to do "in caſe they differ in opinion from their governours, "and cannot in conſcience receive the doctrine taught "by the miniſters, if theſe explain the ſcriptures inva-"riably, according to the confeſſion, which the others "have drawn up?" [2]the profeſſor told him, that they are at liberty to withdraw from the ſociety, and to ſeek new inſtructors and new church-governours. Where ſuch a liberty is allowed; whoever may be the legiſlators in that church, to which a man joyns himſelf, [3]Locke will teach you, that they are not impoſed upon him without his own conſent.

But the governours of Lockes particular churches have "no right to eſtabliſh *whatſoever they may judge* "*to be expedient* for the people." Nor have the go-vernours

9 Lockes works. v. ii. p. 254. 1 Exam. p. 25. 2 Second vindic. p. 14. 3 Locke, v. ii. p. 254.

vernours of my particular churches any ſuch right on my principles, whatever they may have in your repreſentation: [4] a right of proteſtant church-governours to eſtabliſh ſuch doctrines, as are agreeable to ſcripture interpreted according to the beſt of their judgment, is no more a right to eſtabliſh whatſoever they may judge to be expedient, than a right of any other proteſtants to believe ſuch doctrines, as are agreeable to ſcripture interpreted according to the beſt of their judgment, is a right to believe whatſoever they may judge to be expedient.

If you will now conſider the variety, which Lockes particular churches will admit in their internal conſtitution, and, inſtead of giving me a notion of particular churches invented by yourſelf, will try to collect my own from my writings; you will be at loſs, not indeed to hint or to aſſert, for as far as hints and aſſertions will go, you are never at a loſs, but to find a reaſon, which any man of common ſenſe will allow to be a good one, why, though the former may be compared to individual proteſtants, the latter cannot.

XX. It has been ſaid, with more ſmartneſs of expreſſion, than juſtneſs of ſentiment, that [f] "the church of Rome is infallible, and every "proteſtant church is always in the right." The force of this ridicule, ſuch as it is, when applyed by a proteſtant to the eſtabliſhment of confeſſions in a proteſtant church, will return upon himſelf; if we reply, that the pope is infallible, and no individual proteſtant is ever in the wrong. Every proteſtant church, like every individual proteſtant, after uſing all poſſible means of due information, though its faith and doctrines ſhould happen to be falſe, muſt act, as if they were true. If in theſe circumſtances the individual would be obliged in con-

4 Second vindic. p. 7. See above at p. 45.

conſcience to hold them; the governours of the church would be no leſs obliged to ſecure the teaching of them.

Dedication of Steeles ſtate of the Roman-catholic religion, to Clem. xi. p. ii. ſigned Richard Steele, ſuppoſed to have been written by Bp. Hoadley. Biogr. Britan. vol. vi. Hoadley p. 102.

5 "The *grave* profeſſor," you ſay, "goes out of his "way to peck at a certain humourous dedication." He did indeed go as far out of his way as to p. 200. of your former edition, 6 where you *happen* to apply the piece of humour, which is here *pecked at*, to the church of England. But the miſchief is, that he went out of the way of his *gravity*, and has been ſo unlucky, as to give you a ſecond piece of humour, which you do not know how to get rid of, without giving up the firſt.

But let us look back to your *additional preface*, where we find another animadverſion on this paragraph. 7 "The governours of proteſtant churches, though "their doctrines are wrong, ſhould," you ſay, "have "your conſent to abide by them, if you were not afraid "of the profeſſors conſequence, that their duty under "this perſuaſion might lead them to oblige others, who "are otherwiſe perſuaded, to abide by them too on "the peril of wanting the good things theſe churches "and church-governours have to beſtow." We may now ſee "*without a feſcue*," that the chriſtian liberty, which you contend for, is the liberty of obtaining theſe good things on your own terms. But what in the mean time would become of the duty of church-governours? You will laugh in your ſleeve, no doubt, at the *grave* profeſſors queſtion. Your plan is to have an anarchy in the church with yourſelf at the head: and, when you have diſpoſed of the governours, you will leave him to find out, what becomes of their duty.

XIII. Between

5 Conf. p. 177. n. 6 Conf. p. 232. 7 Conf. ad. pref. p. xli.

XXI. Between the church of Rome, which pretends to be infallible, and a proteſtant church, which claims only a right to ſecure the teaching of ſuch doctrines to its members, as it judges, upon the beſt information it can get, to be agreeable to the truth of the goſpel, there is this remarkable difference; that the former cannot change its doctrines without giving up its pretenſions to infallibility; whereas the latter may be better informed at one time, than at another, and may therefore change them without any inconſiſtency. It is no more neceſſary, that a proteſtant church, than that an individual proteſtant, ſhould always maintain the ſame doctrines: both muſt act upon the beſt information, which they have at the time; both however are open to better information, if it be to be had, and are at liberty to act upon better, if they ever obtain it. But as it would be matter of juſt reproach to any private man to be carried about with every wind of doctrine, to take his colour from thoſe, with whom he converſes laſt, and to change his religious opinions as often as he changes his company; ſo would it be ſuch a weakneſs and levity in the governours of any church, as is unbecoming their office, and inconſiſtent with the truſt committed to them, to be led away by every one, who thinks himſelf able to reform it; to change its confeſſion, as often as any are found, who diſlike the faith and doctrines contained in it; to ſuffer themſelves to be perſuaded, that every alteration of former eſtabliſh-

ments muſt needs be an improvement, and that every laſt information is of courſe the beſt.

[8] " The claim of church-governours to ſecure the " teaching of ſuch doctrines to the members of their " churches, as they judge, upon the beſt information, " they can get, to be agreeable to the truth of the " goſpel, is founded," you ſay, " exactly as it might " have been, if the ſcriptures of the new teſtament " were loſt, and the doctrines of them could only be " recovered by ſuch information, as ſcraps of tradition " and mutilated citations in old books would afford. " No room is left for a ſuſpicion, that the written goſ- " pel exhibiting the very doctrines of Chriſt and his " apoſtles is ſtill in being, and in a condition to be " conſulted by every man, who wants information." We have already had ſeveral ſpecimens of your logic, this is another;——becauſe the new teſtament exhibiting the very doctrines of Chriſt and his apoſtles is in being, and in a condition to be conſulted by every man; therefore every man, who conſults it, though he has no other information, than what the book itſelf affords, will ſee, what theſe very doctrines are; and though he has no ſuch ſupplies of knowledge, as are derived from ſtudy and enquiry, from reading and hearing the inſtructions of learned men, will diſcern its meaning both in thoſe parts, [9] which, being hard to be underſtood, are ſometimes wreſted by the unlearned and unſtable to their own deſtruction, and in thoſe likewiſe, which have been obſcured by the perverſe diſputings of men of corrupt minds. This conſequence, if you do not take care to explain and limit it, may make your *conſciencious* miniſters no longer *uſeful*, and may ſend them, as effectually as ſubſcriptions, to get their livelihood in ſome other way. I ſhall leave you to ſettle this matter with them, as well as you can, and to enquire at your leiſure, whether between the want of an infallible interpreter

[8] Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxvi. [9] 2 Pet. iii. 16.

preter to inform men of the true meaning of ſcripture, and the want of no information at all, there is not a medium, which may make proteſtant paſtors and teachers of ſome uſe. At preſent you may obſerve, that the claim of church-governours to guide themſelves by ſcripture interpreted according to the beſt of their judgment, that is, by what they judge upon the beſt information they can get to be agreeable to the truth of the goſpel, [1] is founded on the original principles of proteſtantiſm; and that the information, which I ſpeak of, conſiſts of ſuch ſupplies of knowledge, as may help them to find out, not the writings of the apoſtles, but the true meaning of theſe writings. [2] The examiner indeed "ſays, that church-governours have not done their "duty in the caſe of determining on the ſoundneſs of the "faith and doctrines of thoſe, who deſire to be public "teachers, if they act by this rule, and that they ought to "act by a more certain one." But [3] when I aſked him, what the more certain rule might be, and whether he did not mean the unerring dictates of an infallible church? [4] he deſired in his letter *occaſioned* by my ſecond vindication to be excuſed from coming to an explanation, becauſe it might "draw him into danger and diſgrace."

But the profeſſor goes on from bad to worſe. [5] "He "leaves," you ſay, "not the leaſt ſhadow of a ſuppo-"ſition, that upon the principles of the proteſtant re-"formation every chriſtian is bound to ſearch the ſcrip-"ture for his own information, and to follow what he "finds there at all worldly hazards. The *whole* is "founded upon the preſumption, that no member of "the church, who is not a church-governour, may "have better, or as good, or indeed any information "concerning the agreement of ſuch or ſuch doctrines "with the truth of the goſpel, but what his church-"governours impart to him." What do you include in this *whole?* Cannot the governours of proteſtant

1 See above at p. 45. 2 Exam. p. 41. 42. 3 Second vindic. p. 8. 4 Letter *occaſioned* &c. p. 2. 5 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxvii.

churches "go upon the beſt information they can get," without preſuming, that no other member of their church can have any, or as good, or what may appear to him better information? do they by interpreting ſcripture according to the beſt of their judgment, take the bible out of the hands of any one, or preclude him from interpreting it according to the beſt of his? Perhaps by the *whole* you might only mean a *part*: you might intend to allow the governours of proteſtant churches, as you would any other chriſtians, "to go upon the beſt in-"formation they can get," in judging what doctrines are agreeable to the truth of the goſpel, and to except only againſt the right to *ſecure* the teaching of theſe doctrines. But pray in reading the profeſſors diſcourſe did not you find, [6] that upon his principles church-governours have no right to ſecure the teaching of them by any other means, than ſuch as leave every man to determine for himſelf according to the dictates of his own private judgment, whether they are the doctrines of Chriſt and his apoſtles or not? And does a right thus limited admit no ſhadow of a ſuppoſition, that "every "chriſtian may and ought to ſearch the ſcriptures, and "to follow what he finds there? or is it founded upon "a preſumption, that no member of a church can have "any information, but what the governours of it are "pleaſed to impart to him?"

But you argue about "the claim, *as here ſtated*."—True: the profeſſor, having in the proper places ſtated the limitations of this claim, when he is here ſhewing a remarkable difference between proteſtant churches and the church of Rome, ſtates nothing more, than the ground of this difference; and you in your *additional preface*, which you call *your anſwer to his charge*, paſs over theſe limitations, and repreſent what is here ſtated as his whole account of the right, which he undertook to vindicate. If we ſhould be at a loſs for your *good faith*, we muſt look for it in your notes: and as

6 See parag. IV. V. XV. XVII.

[7] as you have in this preface informed your readers, that what you leave to be examined in these notes are only strictures on the *confessional*, not connected with the professors general argument; some of them may possibly never look far enough to find it.

The right of every christian, as far as his salvation is concerned, to search the scriptures, to seek for information concerning the doctrines contained in them, and to guide both his faith and his practice by the best, which he can get, is not only supposed, but is carefully guarded, in my discourse. If indeed you mean to carry this matter farther, and would maintain, that every christian, who thinks himself to have better information, than the governours of the church, of which he is a member, has therefore a right to be admitted to the office of a public teacher in it; and that they have no right to examine into his doctrines, and, if these, according to what they think the best information, are not agreeable to the truth of the gospel, to refuse him admission into this office; I hope, there is not, I certainly did not intend there should be, in my discourse the least shadow of such a supposition, as this.

[8] "The strangest part of the story is," you say, "that this claim is put in by the professor for the governours of protestant churches, even while he is "pretending to shew *the difference*" [you should have said *a difference*] "between these churches and the "church of Rome." Indeed you are mistaken. It is a stranger part of the story, that you should read my charge from one end to the other without seeing, that this claim was *put in*, before you came to the last paragraph. And it is still stranger, that after reading this paragraph you should see no difference between the claim of the governours of protestant churches to proceed upon the best information they can get, and the claim of the governours of the church of Rome to

[7] Conf. ad. pref. p. vii. viii. [8] Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxvii.

to be infallible, but ſhould aſk; [9] "Whether the lat-
"ter will not ſay, that they go upon the beſt informa-
"tion they can get?"

After the examiner had enquired; [1] "What tyran-
"ny the church of Rome exerciſes over the conſciences
"of men, which exceeds what the governours of pro-
"teſtant churches have on my principles and reaſon-
"ings a right to exerciſe;" and [2] I had told him, that the pope claims an infallible authority in all matters of faith and doctrine, and a ſupremacy, which would extend this authority over the whole church of Chriſt; whereas according to my principles and reaſonings the governours of proteſtant churches can claim neither; in his letter *occaſioned* by my ſecond vindication he paſſes over the claim of infallibility in profound ſilence, and having aſſured me with great gravity, that [3] "he
"never charged me with contending for the popes ſu-
"premacy over *all* churches, reminds me, that I have
"ſhifted the queſtion." It was certainly prudent to drop that part of my anſwer, which he did not know what to do with. What he ſays to the other part may poſſibly be ſaid to the beſt of his knowledge. For though he could not but be aware; that [4] he had charged me with claiming for proteſtant church-governours ſuch a right of eſtabliſhing the doctrines of their confeſſion, as in caſe the people could not in conſcience receive theſe doctrines, would make it impoſſible for them to find any inſtructors elſewhere, but ſuch, as are obliged to teach the ſame; that he had repreſented this ſuppoſed claim as a tyranny over mens conſciences; and that [5] I had fully replied to this charge; yet he might poſſibly be ignorant, that the claim of ſupremacy, which the pope *puts in* for himſelf, is juſt ſuch an one, as he had ſuppoſed me to *put in* for the governours of proteſtant churches.

You

9 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxvi. 1 Exam. p. 27. 2 Sec. vind. p. 23. 3 Letter *occaſioned*, &c. p. 53. 4 Exam. p. 24, 25. 5 Sec. vind. p. 14, 15, 20, 21.

[7] You had my ſecond vindication before you, when you were writing your *additional preface*, and might therefore ſee the anſwer, which I had given to his enquiry. [8] But his *incomparable* letter ſeems to have come out too late to teach you, what was to be done with the claims of the pope to ſupremacy and infallibility. For want of this [9] "*able and ingenious*" guide; where I take notice of a remarkable difference, between proteſtant churches and the church of Rome, ariſing out of the claim of the latter to be infallible, [1] you call it *the difference*, as if upon my principles there was no other, and thus leave the popes claim to ſupremacy out of the queſtion. But that his claim to infallibility might not be quite open to the view of your readers, you throw a flimzy covering over it, and repreſent it as nothing more than a claim "to go upon "the beſt information he can get." You were afraid however, that they would not be quite ſatisfied with this account of the matter; for the ſentence, in which that remarkable difference is ſtated, ſtill ſtared you in the face;——"The church of Rome cannot change "its doctrines without giving up its claim to infallibi-"lity; whereas proteſtant churches may be better in-"formed at one time, than at another, and may there-"fore change them without any inconſiſtency;"—— can then infallible information, might any one aſk, which muſt be the ſame at all times, be nothing more than ſuch information, as, "though it is the beſt, "which can be gotten at the time," may be better at one time, than at another? Never mind that, ſay you: [2] "whether proteſtant churches may, or may not, change "their confeſſions without any inconſiſtency is *juſt as it* "*happens:* for before we get to the bottom of the "page, we find, there are caſes wherein proteſtant "churches cannot change their confeſſions without be-"ing.

7 Conf. ad. pref. xxxi. 8 Conf. poſtſcript, p. 410. note. 9 Conf. poſtſcript, p. 409. 1 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxvii. 2 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxvii.

" ing inconſiſtent." You have made a diſtinction here, as the plain citizen had talked proſe, without knowing it: and, what may perhaps give you a greater averſion to diſtinctions, than you had before, it is ſuch an one, as brings the whole matter out of your hands as ſafe, as it came into them. The church of Rome cannot change its doctrines without giving up its pretenſions to infallibility: but proteſtant churches may be better informed at one time than at another; and therefore, if they change their eſtabliſhed confeſſion, they do nothing, which is in itſelf inconſiſtent with their pretenſions, though, as you rightly diſtinguiſh, it may *by accident* be inconſiſtent with their duty.

The concluſion of my diſcourſe gives you great offence; not that you have any thing to object to the truth of what is affirmed in it; but you ſuſpect, that [3] I might intend to inſinuate that the writer of the *confeſſional* is " a conceited wronghead, or no body knows " who:" whereas you would have me to know, that you keep good company; for " ſome of the wiſeſt and " beſt of the governours of proteſtant churches have " confeſſed, that requiring ſubſcription to any ſyſtema- " tical formularies is a *great impoſition*; and have " wiſhed to be *well rid* of ſome things maintained in " them, as matters of which *no good account could be* " *given.*" But pray, do not you remember telling us, that one of the wiſeſt and beſt of them [4] " wrote a " book with the avowed purpoſe of making men eaſy " under their obligations to ſubſcribe; an attempt " which could in your opinion have no other tendency, " than to perpetuate the *impoſition* in all ſucceeding " ages;" and that [5] " he was preſſed into this ſervice by " another" of the wiſeſt and beſt of them, whom you would willingly ſuppoſe " to have wiſhed at the bot- " tom to be *well rid* of ſubſcriptions," but are forced to own, that [6] " the evidence, which you had before " you is by no means favourable to ſuch a ſuppoſition."

You

3 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxix, xxxviii. 4 Conf. p. 80. 5 Conf. p. 83, 84. 6 Conf. 83. note.

You may perhaps tell me here, that I have *tacked things together*, which are at the diſtance of more than a hundred and ſeventy pages from one another: and if you do, I ſhall plead guilty. For it muſt be owned, that though in your *additional preface*, where you thought it might anſwer a preſent purpoſe, you call them ſome of the wiſeſt and beſt of the governours of proteſtant churches; yet in the body of your book, where you had another purpoſe to ſerve, you repreſent one of them as too fond of [7] *healing meaſures* and *middle ways*, the other as carried by [8] "*mere complaiſance* into "meaſures, which were contrary to his natural bent," and both of them as purſuing [9] "*trimming* methods in "matters of religion."

But after all, if you know any governours of proteſtant churches, who have affirmed, that to require ſubſcription to an eſtabliſhed confeſſion from thoſe, who are candidates for the office of public teaching, is an *unwarrantable impoſition*, I have laid my reaſons for differing from them before the public: and, whether theſe reaſons are out-weighed by their authority, is left to the judgment of my readers. It is a plain ſign of your having ſome miſgivings about your own performance, that, after *twiſting* my arguments into all ſhapes, and trying your ſtrength upon them in all, you have recourſe to authority.

As to thoſe governours of proteſtant churches, who without wiſhing to lay aſide all ſubſcriptions may have wiſhed *to be well rid* of ſome things contained in any particular confeſſion; they are not concerned in any thing, which I have ſaid; unleſs you ſuppoſe them to have been led to this wiſh, not by ſcripture interpreted according to the beſt of their judgment, but by ſuch weakneſs and levity, as would make them ready to follow every one, who might think himſelf qualified for a reformer, and to change the confeſſion of their church, as often as any ſhould be found, who diſliked the faith

7 Conf. p. 83. 8 Conf. p. 88. 9 Conf. p. 87

and doctrines contained in it. Had it been otherwiſe; had I arraigned either their wiſdom, or their goodneſs; they would not have found an advocate in the author of the *confeſſional*. For, however willing he might have been to ſhelter himſelf under their authority by ſuggeſting, that they are of the ſame opinion with himſelf, he is no reformer of confeſſions: to content him they muſt be aboliſhed; and his [1] "moſt eminent and moſt liberal-ſpirited writers are ſuch only, as "either in expreſs terms, or by plain and neceſſary conſequence have condemned them."

I am, SIR,

Yours, *&c.*

1 Conf. ad. pref. p. xxxviii.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

THE END.